DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 271 IR 002 816

TITLE	Arts 100: Communications 1971-72.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Educational Communications Authority, Toronto. Research and Planning Branch.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	137p.; Papers and Reports Concerning Educational Communications Number 20 and 21; Not available in hard copy due to reproducibility of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Skills; *Course Evaluation; *Educational Television; Higher Education; *Multimedia Instruction; Summative Evaluation; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Gordon (Donald); *Ontario Educational Communications Authority; University of Waterloo

ABSTRACT

A communications course was developed as a multimedia course using supplementary learning resources, such as audiotape cassettes and a series of televised lectures. To obtain information about the appropriateness and effectiveness of the methodology of the course, the research and development branch of the Ontario Educational Communications Authority commissioned an evaluation study. Section 1 of this report presents the results of that evaluation. Section 2 of the report presents an evaluation of another, followup course. The major results of the investigations conducted was to improve the courses for the following years and to recognize the need to continue the evaluation process. (HB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115271

The Ontario Educational
Communications Authority

Research and
Development Branch

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Number 20
Number 21

ARTS 100: COMMUNICATIONS

1971-72

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ontario Educational Communications Authority
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR 002 816

© The Ontario Educational Communications Authority, 1972.

The material in this report is not to be quoted or cited without permission of The Ontario Educational Communications Authority.

INTRODUCTION

Arts 100: Communications is a communications course designed by Donald R. Gordon of the University of Waterloo. Originally, it was taught by Professor Gordon and others at the University of Waterloo without the aid of television; however, during the 1971-72 academic year, a series of televised lectures, featuring Professor Gordon as the lecturer, were used for the course instead of the traditional live lectures. These televised lectures were produced and transmitted by The Ontario Educational Communications Authority (OECA). In addition, the OECA and the University of Waterloo developed supplementary learning resources, including a set of audio-tape cassettes, making the course for the first time a multi-media learning experience.

To obtain information about the appropriateness and effectiveness of the revised methodology in the Arts 100 course, The Research and Development Branch of the OECA commissioned an evaluation study of the course as it was designed and offered in the 1971-72 academic year. The investigators were Drs. Marvin Brown and Edward E. Ware of the University of Waterloo; Section I of this report presents the results of that evaluation.

During the same year, 1971-72, the multi-media Arts 100 course was used as a basis for developing a communications course at Erindale College, Communications 100E. The Erindale course was not offered in the way that the Arts 100 course was designed. However, because it

incorporated some of the Arts 100 components, including the televised lectures, it provided an opportunity for studying other possible uses of these components. Consequently, The Research and Development Branch of the OECA also conducted an evaluation of Communications 100E for the 1971-72 year. The Project Officer for this latter study was Dr. Donald M. Keller and the findings of his study can be found in Section II. (Page 87)

In interpreting the findings of Dr. Keller's report, one must remember that the study was an evaluation of Communications 100E, not Arts 100. Findings regarding the use of various Arts 100 components provide insight into the appropriateness or inappropriateness of these components in the course, Communications 100E; they should not be used, however, in any assessment of the Arts 100 course per se.

The major result of the investigations conducted during the past year has been an improved Arts 100 course for the 1972-73 year. The course will be offered again at the University of Waterloo. In addition, a more definitive evaluation project has been designed. It is obvious that on-going evaluation is a prerequisite if positive course evaluation is to be maximized.

SECTION I

EVALUATION OF ARTS 100: COMMUNICATIONS

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

1971-72

by

Marvin Brown and Edward E. Ware

University of Waterloo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii
Introduction	iv
Arts 100	1
Procedure	3
Recruitment of Participants	3
Weekly Activity Sheet	4
Mid-Year Evaluation Questionnaires	6
Final Evaluation Questionnaires	7
Course Examination	10
Comparison Groups	12
Course Dropouts	13
Results and Discussion	14
Students' Demographic Data	14
Students' Course Expectations	17
Viewers' Demographic Data	19
Viewers' Programme Expectations	22
Weekly Activity Sheet	22
Mid-Year Evaluation Questionnaires	26
Final Evaluation Questionnaires	33
Change from Mid-Year to Final Evaluation	46
Examination	50
Mass Media Survey	53
Conclusions and Implications	54
Appendix A: General Information Sheet	59
Appendix B: Weekly Activity Sheet	60
Appendix C: Student Evaluation Questionnaire	61
Appendix D: Mass Media Survey	66
Appendix E: Nonstudent Evaluation Questionnaire	68
Appendix F: Examination	71
Appendix G: Intercorrelations	78
Appendix H: Mass Media Survey Results	82

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was carried out and funded under a contract between the Research and Development Branch of The Ontario Educational Communications Authority and the investigators through the Waterloo Research Institute (WRI Project 1076, October, 1971). Considerable assistance was provided by Gary Reker, Reena Kronitz and Donna Wobbe, graduate students in Psychology.

Many people at the University and OECA greatly facilitated the execution of the project, though we can mention only a few by name. We wish to thank Professor Donald Gordon for his co-operation and advice. Edith Rice, the administrative assistant for Arts 100, was extremely helpful in many ways and the project owes much to her. The OECA project officers provided ideas and helpful comments. Then, of course, it was the responsiveness of the Arts 100 students and viewers that really "made" the project, and we are very much indebted to them.

ABSTRACT

This project sought to evaluate the effects of Arts 100 on the students enrolled in it and on the nonstudents who viewed the weekly televised lectures. Several questionnaires, a survey of attitudes toward the mass media and a course examination were developed for this purpose. About half the students in the course completed the final questionnaire. The part-time, mainly adult, students rated the course very highly. The ratings of the full-time students were moderately positive. Both groups gave positive evaluations of most of the course components -- the lectures, the text book, the lecture notes, the assignments and the audio tapes. Only the monthly seminars were negatively evaluated.

The lecture material on the mass media was much better received than that on the senses. A considerable number of the students reported changes in their attitudes toward the mass media, generally in the direction of greater scepticism about the media as sources of information. The examination revealed that Arts 100 students were better able to deal with material about communications than were other university students.

The reactions of a group of 80 volunteer nonstudent viewers were similar to those of the part-time students. This group, which was not necessarily typical of all viewers, watched the broadcasts regularly and was quite enthusiastic about them.

ARTS 100

The University of Waterloo, in co-operation with the Ontario Educational Communications Authority (OECA), offered Arts 100: Communications -- A Course on the New Literacy, during the 1971/72 academic year. According to the course announcement

> Arts 100: Communications is intended to facilitate the understanding and use of contemporary communications media. It explores the various kinds of information available to modern man through his senses, and it considers the relationship between sensory perception and communication. The course includes sections on the mass media (print, film, radio and television), alternatives to the mass media, and language and logic. Communication is shown to be an orchestrated process involving the simultaneous use of many techniques and devices. Finally, evidence is presented for and against the proposition that conventional literacy is now being replaced by a new literacy involving the various communications media.

The course made use of 30 weekly half-hour television broadcasts, a textbook (Professor Gordon's The New Literacy), 12 audiotape cassettes, notes on the audio and videotapes, monthly small group seminar meetings, and a toll-free phone line between students and the course assistants. The students' course grades were based upon seven assignments completed at the rate of roughly one per month during the academic year.

Although university course-enrolment figures are imprecise (Arts 100 is no exception to that rule), at last count (March 27) there seemed to be 317 students officially enrolled in the course.[1] This number may be too high since 14 students officially on the class list had not handed in any assignments by the end of the course. Of the 317, 201 (63.4%) were full-time students who took Arts 100 as part of their five or six course load. Among the full-time students were some in all faculties of the University. About half of them were in Arts, with sizeable numbers in Mathematics and

---

[1] The Registrar's Office counted 322 official registrants on December 1, 1971 for Provincial Grant purposes. We use the later figure of 317 provided by the Interfaculty Programme Board, the administrative unit in charge of Arts 100. Even this figure probably overestimates the number of students in the course as grades were submitted for only 303.

Environmental Studies, a smaller number in Science and a few students in each of the other faculties. The other 116 students were part-time -- 109 having registered in the University specifically to take Arts 100. Of the 109 students taking only Arts 100, 75 lived outside the Kitchener-Waterloo area -- 48 in the Toronto area, 12 in Oshawa and 15 in Hamilton.

The course dropout rate was quite low. Although comparable figures are not available, the drop rate of approximately 12 (less than 5%) does seem to be lower than other comparable courses (e.g., Introductory Psychology and Sociology).

It would seem that the course was quite successful in attracting full-time students. There was a substantial increase in its enrolment from 135 in 1970/71. On the other hand, fewer part-time students than were originally projected enrolled. The University, in its response to the draft report of the Wright Commission, stated that the part-time enrolment "turned out to be one third of what had been estimated." Since we lack data for part-time enrolment in comparable courses, it is difficult to know what to make of the numbers. Further, the projected enrolment seems to have been more a guess than a well-researched projection. It appears fair to say that the 1971-72 course enrolment could not be accurately projected.

Since the television broadcasts were shown over channels 19 (Toronto) and 13 (Kitchener-Waterloo), there was also an audience of viewers who watched the telecasts but who were not enrolled in the course. The BBM Fall survey of Channel 19 viewers[2] (weeks of November 1-14) estimated 3100, 5700 and 7600 viewers for the Tuesday, Thursday and Sunday broadcasts, respectively. In March the comparable figures were 7400, 8300 and 4000, suggesting an increase

---

[2]These figures are projections based upon telephone interviews of fewer than 1700 people (only 600 in the Toronto area). As such, they are imprecise and could involve substantial errors. They should be taken as very rough estimates only.

viewers, a true/false "Content Examination" based on the text and TV presentations, and a measure of attitudes toward the mass media ("Mass Media Survey"). Copies of these instruments are included in the Appendices and more detailed descriptions are given in the Results section of this report.

PARTICIPANTS IN STUDY

Project participants were recruited in much the same manner as they were last year:

1. Viewers

An abbreviated version of last year's "spot" was run at the end of a number of televised lectures asking for volunteers to "fill out a couple of 'simple questionnaires' in return for which we'll send you materials to use in conjunction with the programs". The spots were run in two series. The first, from October 29 through December 3, 1972, produced 30 volunteers. The second, from February 27 through March 18, 1973, produced an additional 16 volunteers.

In April, questionnaires and a free copy of The New Literacy were sent to these 46 volunteers; 11 of the first group and 13 of the second returned completed questionnaires. It is interesting that last year, a single series of "spots" produced 123 volunteers of whom 76 were respondents at the end of the year. These figures suggest lower viewer "involvement" and are consistent with the apparent decrease in the size of the viewing audience noted later.

2. Students

Like last year, students were asked to participate in the evaluation

information. It also asked for the student's educational background, his or her status as a student (i.e., whether full-time or part-time, etc.), and related questions. This sheet was sent to all students enrolled in the course. It was accompanied by a cover letter from Professor Gordon urging students to take part in the project and assuring them that individual responses would be kept confidential. Another cover letter from the investigators described the general purpose of the project and what the students would be asked to do. It stressed that responses would be anonymous and would be tied only to a project-related code number. An addressed postage-paid envelope was also provided. In all, 224 (70.7%) of the students returned completed forms. One hundred and ninety-three students returned completed forms in time to be included in the mid-year evaluation. The analysis of the demographic data (see below) is based on these returns. The 70% return rate was a pleasant surprise in that we had anticipated about a 50% return.

Weekly Activity Sheet

We were also interested in the amount of time students spent on the various course-related activities. After considering several possible ways of obtaining such an index, we devised a log, called the "Weekly Activity Sheet", on which the students could record the time spent on each of the course activities (watching TV lecture, preparing assignments, reading, etc.) during a specified one-week period (see Appendix B). We felt and experience confirmed that this part of the form would be easy to use and relatively unsusceptible to either faulty memory or deliberate distortion on the part of the students. We were also interested in the students' evaluations of each of the course activities. Since the mid-year and final evaluations dealt with relatively general reactions to, for example, the text and the

TV series, we thought it would be useful to obtain evaluations of specific broadcasts or chapters. On the back of the Weekly Activity Sheet the students were asked to indicate how valuable they found each activity engaged in during the week by circling the appropriate number on a seven-point rating scale running from "little or no value" (1) to "extremely worthwhile" (7).

The students who had agreed to participate by returning a completed General Information Sheet by November 15th (N=155) were divided into four groups. Each group was sent a Weekly Activity Sheet covering one of the weeks of November 15, 22, 29 or December 6. We originally planned to continue sending out the logs for 11 weeks starting January 3, 1972, so that each student would be surveyed about three times during the course.

We soon discovered several serious difficulties with the Weekly Activity Sheet and, as a result, decided to discontinue its use. (1) Only 108 students, 69.7% of those to whom the form had been sent, returned it. The comments on the forms returned indicated that some students resented completing this particulr form. Also, the return rate tended to be quite variable and generally to decrease from mailing to mailing (November 15 = 90%, November 22 = 73%, November 29 = 46%, December 6 = 68%). (2) The students took a long time to return the forms, so that in many cases we could not be sure which week was being reported. For example, one return for the week of November 29th was received by us on February 9th. And for the December 6th mailing, only 7 returns were received within the 2 weeks of the mailing date (18 others were received later -- several much later). (3) Most important, perhaps, was the indication that while the log section posed no problems, a number of students did not understand how to do the evaluative ratings of the weekly activities. These problems, coupled with the clear tendency for successive mailings of project materials to produce

diminishing return rates (see below) led us to abandon our weekly logs. The measure of primary interest -- the time spent in course-related activities -- could be obtained on the Mid-Year and Final Evaluation Questionnaire without increasing the risk of losing respondents.

Mid-Year Evaluation Questionnaires

In order to obtain interim evaluations of Arts 100 from both the students and the nonstudent viewers, two three-page questionnaires were administered at about the halfway point of the course. The questionnaires were similar in content and format except that the face sheet of the non-student questionnaire asked for some of the same information as did the students' General Information Sheet (education, occupation, age, sex, etc.), as well as general information concerning the viewing of the Arts 100 series (e.g., reasons for watching, what they thought they were getting out of the programmes so far, how regularly the broadcasts were viewed, whether they were seen in colour or black and white, alone or with others, etc.). In both questionnaires, the questions were mainly multiple choice, but considerable opportunity was provided for more open-ended responses. These responses clarified and elaborated upon the multiple-choice responses, and were very helpful in the development of the final evaluation questionnaires. Since the mid-year questionnaires were very similar to those used at the end of the course, it is not necessary to describe them in detail here.

The student questionnaire was sent to the 193 students who had returned the General Information Sheet by January 15th. In all, 125 students (64.8%) returned completed questionnaires. The questionnaire for the non-students was sent to the 123 viewers who had volunteered earlier and 88 of them (71.5%) returned questionnaires. All nonstudent respondents were sent

---

[4] Copies and descriptions of the mid-year questionnaires, as well as analysis and discussion of the responses are given in the interim report of this project.

a copy of the programme notes for the TV lectures as promised in the televised "spots" which had invited them to participate. In addition, every second respondent was sent a copy of Professor Gordon's course text The New Literacy. This was done to permit us to determine whether the addition of relevant materials would affect the viewers' final reactions to the series.

The response rates from both the students and nonstudents illustrate a problem we had been concerned about from the outset of the study. With each mailing fewer people continued to respond. A problem that had not been anticipated involved the extremely high mobility rate and consequent address changes of our student sample (this was much less true of the nonstudent sample, though even in this group there was a fair bit of moving). We know that some 15% of the students changed addresses during the academic year -- some several times. Undoubtedly there were other students whom we just lost track of. This may account for some of the progressive attritions. For these reasons we decided to discontinue all mailings until the final evaluation.

Final Evaluation Questionnaires

The most important part of the project involved the end-of-course questionnaires. An attempt was made to make the student and the nonstudent questionnaires short enough so that they could be completed in thirty minutes. Like the mid-year questionnaires, the format was mainly multiple-choice. A few questions asked for open-ended responses and there was room beside every question to clarify or elaborate upon the response checked. Each questionnaire had two parts: one concerning the evaluation of Arts 100, the other dealing with attitudes toward and use of several of the most popular mass media.

Student Questionnaire. The Student Evaluation Questionnaire (see Appendix C) had 29 questions and was five pages long. The 22 multiple-choice items covered general evaluations of the course as a whole (e.g., "To what extent has Arts 100 met your personal expectations?" -- almost completely to not at all; "How would you rate Arts 100 overall?" -- excellent to poor; "Do you feel that the time devoted to Arts 100 was well spent?" -- always to never), as well as specific components of the course such as the book ("How worthwhile did you fine the book The New Literacy?" -- extremely worthwhile to a waste of time), the seminars and the assignments. Several questions dealt with the televised lectures (e.g., "How understandable did you find the TV lectures?" -- extremely to not at all understandable) as well as specific aspects of the lectures (e.g., "What effect do you think the use of the puppet had on the TV lectures?" and "How do you feel about Professor Gordon's use of 'academic' or technical language?" -- too much, just about right or too little). The open-ended questions focused on the telephone line (an area that the mid-year evaluation suggested should be explored), and asked about the amount of time spent on the course, any "nonacademic" effects of the course, its most and least valuable aspects and suggestions for improvement.

Mass Media Survey. Attached to the student questionnaire was a two-page questionnaire (see Appendix D) concerned with the use of several of the most popular mass media (TV, radio, books, newspapers, magazines, and movies) as sources of information, and the respondent's opinions regarding the accuracy and objectivity of these media. The Mass Media Survey asked the respondent to indicate how accurate or biased he felt each medium in general was, and also how he felt about those parts of each he made use of (e.g., to TV in general as well as the specific TV programmes he watched). The questionnaire also asked about any changes in use or attitudes during recent months.

Because of the problem with response rates already mentioned (p. 7) it was decided to have the students complete the questionnaire and the course exam (see below) in their seminar meetings. With Professor Gordon's agreement all students in the course were asked to attend any one of 13 seminar sessions scheduled from March 21st to April 8th for this purpose. Since seminar attendance had been quite low, the students were told that those who completed the final evaluation questionnaire (whether or not they had completed previous items) would be given a free copy of Benjamin Singer's "Communications in Canadian Society", a recently published paperback worth $4.75. The students were also told that if they could not attend any of the seminars they could complete the questionnaire by mail by returning a card to the project. In all, 84 students completed the final evaluation in the seminar groups (some three times the number that had been attending the same seminars) and another 61[5] received and returned it by mail. Thus, 145 students, 45.7% of those apparently in the course (50.2% of those who had handed in at least one assignment) made up our student sample. We feel that under the circumstances this was an excellent sample.

Nonstudent Questionnaire. The questionnaire for the nonstudent viewers (see Appendix E) was comparable in format and content to the student questionnaire. It asked many of the same questions about the televised lectures (e.g., "How would you rate Arts 100 overall?") and also asked for comparisons between Arts 100 and general TV fare as well as educational TV. This questionnaire was three pages long. The two-page Mass Media Survey was also attached. The combined questionnaire was sent to all 123 volunteers, whether they had completed the mid-year questionnaire or not, on April 3rd,

---

[5]To permit the analyses and the issuing of this report on schedule, a cutoff date of May 12th was used. Returns received after this date have not been included. The return rates cited are, therefore, lower than the actual rates.

the Monday of the final week of the Arts 100 series. A reminder letter was sent on April 28th. In all, 76 of the 88 (86%) viewers who had completed the mid-year questionnaire and four of the 35 who had not (11%) responded, for a nonstudent viewer sample of 80.

It is not clear why one third of the volunteers failed to complete the questionnaire. Part of the reason may involve the original delays (up to two months in a few cases, one month in most cases) in getting the mid-year questionnaire to the volunteers, although several letters were sent informing them that there would be such delays. A few of the names we received were sent in error. But we are unable to explain an attrition rate of this magnitude, given the fact that we were dealing with volunteers in the first instance. Perhaps some of them stopped watching Arts 100. (Also see footnote three, page three.)

Course Examination

In addition to any other effects of Arts 100, we were also interested in the acquisition and application of the course content. The seven course assignments did measure this, but we felt that the assignments were too general for our purposes. And since we wished to compare the knowledge about communications of the Arts 100 students to others who had not taken the course, it was necessary to develop a relatively standardized instrument -- in effect, a course examination.

The course material does not readily lend itself to "objective" (multiple-choice) questions. Long essays are both unreliable and time consuming to administer and grade. Therefore, we decided upon a short essay format for the exam.

The exam was designed to measure the three major objectives of

the course as defined by Professor Gordon: (1) critical judgment of the mass media, (2) understanding the role and importance of sensory perception and (3) understanding the role and limitations of language in communication. It was intended to be appropriate to the course, but also to permit those not in the course (see below) to answer the questions. That is, the exam had to be "fair" to both Arts 100 students and those not in the course.

The final examination was developed by the course assistant[6] in consultation with members of the evaluation project, Professor Gordon, and the OECA project officers. It was agreed by all concerned that the exam was a reasonable measure of mastery of the course content, and that it could also be done by people who had not taken Arts 100. Appendix F includes the exam and the scoring key.

The examination was administered to all 84 students attending the final seminar sessions. It was done after the questionnaire in order to keep it from affecting responses to the questionnaire. It was presented as part of the final evaluation procedure, some questions about communications, rather than as an "exam" per se. The students were assured that their answers would not be used in arriving at their final course grades. Forty-five minutes were allowed, although many students finished in less time.

The answers were graded by the course assistant, using a scoring scheme developed in conjunction with the project team. The scheme (see Appendix F) assigned specific numbers of points to various responses and was relatively objective. As a scoring check, the exams of 30 students, selected randomly from among the groups taking the exam, in proportion to their size, were scored independently by a member of the project team who had helped develop the system and was familiar with it. For the 30 exams, the two sets of total scores intercorrelated .82 (.85, .83 and .69 for the three questions),

---

[6]We are indebted to Edith Rice for developing and grading the examination.

indicating high agreement between the two graders of the same questions, and more than acceptable reliability of the exam scoring.

Comparison Groups[7]

Examination. Since we had no measure of Arts 100 students' knowledge about communications before they took the course, it was important to compare what they knew at the end of it, as measured by the exam, with what other, comparable groups knew at the same point in time. Several comparison groups were used. One was a class of 20 Introductory Psychology (Psychology 102) students (these students were roughly comparable to those taking Arts 100 in terms of distribution of academic years and programmes). A group of 39 students taking a Social Psychology extension course at Waterloo Lutheran University (Psychology 205L) was used because it contained many "adult" students, like the part-time students in Arts 100. In addition, we had access to a grade 13 class, and administered the exam to 18 grade 13 history students at Waterloo Collegiate. This was done to see how a grade 13 group would compare with the university groups. In each case the exam was given during a regular class period, with 45 minutes being allowed. The exams were done anonymously. All those taking the exam were given a copy of The New Literacy afterwards.

Mass Media Survey. For reasons similar to those outlined above, we needed comparison groups for the Mass Media Survey. Four such groups were obtained: A different Psychology 102 (N=20) class taught by one of the authors, the Psychology 205L (N=39) class at Waterloo Lutheran, and two classes taking Psychological Statistics (52 in Psychology 283, 35 in Psychology 284). The survey was given at the end of each of these classes

[7]We wish to thank John Shaw, Gary Reker, Dave Reid, Gary Griffin, John Dunbar and Marvin Brown for making class time available to us. We also thank their students for being so helpful.

and took about five minutes to complete. These responses were all anonymous.

Course Dropouts

We had hoped to be able to determine the dropout rate in Arts 100 and to compare it with that of other, comparable courses. We had also planned to contact those dropping the course to determine their reasons for doing so. A list of the twelve students who were thought to have dropped the course was obtained near the end of the course. We could not locate the phone numbers of six of them (and did not pursue them since we felt they would be disinclined to respond to our questions by mail). Only four of the other six could be reached. One had registered in the course by accident and had corrected this by officially "dropping" it. Two had fallen behind in their work, and the fourth, a nonstudent, had taken the course hoping it would provide techniques of media presentation. When he found that it was not doing this, he dropped the course, though he continued to watch the televised lectures.

It is clear that our attempted analysis of the course dropouts was not successful. Indeed, since many students enrolled in the course well beyond the usual "add" period for other courses, only those who had already seen enough of it to know they were interested in it would have registered. The number who dropped was probably much lower than for comparable courses, but the dropout rate is not a very meaningful index. In future it would be interesting to examine drop rates of those students preregistering for Arts 100 as compared to those preregistering for other courses.

Results and Discussion

Students' Demographic Data

The demographic data were obtained from the "General Information Sheet" which was, unfortunately, not completed by all the students in Arts 100. The data below are based on the 193 completed returns received in time for the mid-year evaluation. However, this group includes 116 (80%) of the 145 students who took part in the final evaluation and is in most respects quite representative of the course as a whole.

Table 1 shows that most students in this sample were full-time (71.0%). This figure over-represents the full-time proportion (63.4%) in the course as a whole. It also underestimates the number of students who registered primarily to take Arts 100. This is probably because we recruited volunteers early in the term and close to 75 students (almost all part-time) had not yet registered by that time. As indicated above 80% of the students who completed the final evaluation questionnaire were from the original 193 volunteers, and there is no reason to suspect any important demographic differences between the groups, with two exceptions: The final evaluation group contained fewer full-time students (51%) and more adult students (28%). The students in the sample of 193, like all those in the course, were mainly from the Faculty of Arts, though there were some from all other faculties. Almost half of them were in first year, with sizeable numbers in years 2 and 3. This "mix" of students is just about what would be found in most introductory Arts courses. Since the two groups were probably not comparable, in most cases separate analyses of the results have been carried out for full-time and part-time students. There were no relationships of interest between any other demographic and any of the outcome variables.

Table 1

Demographic Data -- Students Completing "General Information Sheet" (N=193)

	Number[a]	Percent
Age		
Up to 20	81	42.2
21 - 25	66	34.4
26 - 30	10	5.2
31 - 40	19	9.9
41 - 50	12	6.3
51 - 60	4	2.1
Mean	24.5	
Median	21.0	
S.D.	8.5	
Sex		
Male	110	57.0
Female	83	43.0
Occupation		
Student	139	72.4
Teacher	28	14.6
Housewife	9	4.7
Other	16	8.3
Highest level of education completed		
Grade 12	9	4.7
Grade 13	54	28.0
Community College	27	14.0
Some University	93	48.2
Other	10	5.2
Current student status		
Full-time	137	71.0
Part-time (degree)	21	10.9
Non-degree part-time	35	18.1
Adult student?		
Yes	27	14.0
No	166	86.0

Table 1 - (cont'd)

	Number[a]	Percent
Enrolled primarily to take Arts 100?		
Yes	27	14.0
No	166	86.0
Faculty		
Arts	121	65.4
Science	11	5.9
Environmental Studies	21	11.4
Mathematics	24	13.0
Physical Education Recreation	4	2.2
Integrated Studies	3	1.6
Engineering	1	0.5
Year		
First	76	48.7
Second	41	26.3
Third	31	19.9
Fourth	8	5.1
Lectures watched on		
Black and white TV	89	46.6
Colour TV	76	39.8
Both	26	13.6
Seminars taken in:		
Waterloo	166	86.0
Toronto	15	7.8
Erindale	7	3.6
Oshawa	3	1.6
Hamilton	2	1.0

[a]Not all students completed all questions. The numbers of responses vary slightly from variable to variable.

Students' Course Expectations

Table 2 summarizes the reasons given by the sample of 193 students for taking Arts 100 and what they expected to get out of the course. As might be expected, many reasons for taking Arts 100 were given. These seem to divide into five major groups: Half the students cited an interest in the area of communications (27.5 + 19.2 + 4.2%); some had heard that the course was interesting or worthwhile (23.8 + 6.7%); others cited its occupational relevance (11.4 + 12.4%); and a significant number cited convenience, the possibility of an easy credit and similar reasons (22.5 + 11.4%); finally, a few students cited personal growth or development as the reason for taking the course.

When asked what they hoped to get out of the course, the students gave somewhat similar answers: Two thirds stated they hoped for increased awareness and understanding and another 18% gave a related answer -- knowledge; 20% stated they hoped for a credit, and 12% mentioned personal development and satisfaction.

These reasons seem to be similar to those we imagine would be given for taking most courses, although, lacking data, no direct comparisons are possible.

Table 2

Students' Reasons for Taking and Expectations of Arts 100 (N=193)

	No. Students Stating	% of Students Responding
Reasons for taking Arts 100		
Interested in communication	53	27.5
Heard or thought it was interesting	46	23.8

Table 2 - (Cont'd)

	No. Students Stating	% of Students Responding[a]
Reasons for taking Arts 100 - cont'd		
Easy option and credit; break from other courses	43	22.5
Gain knowledge and understanding of communication and mass media	37	19.2
Further education and upgrading qualifications	24	12.4
Convenience	22	11.4
Help in present or future occupation	22	11.4
Recommended by a friend	13	6.7
Personal growth	9	4.7
Interest in educational television	8	4.2
Hope to get out of the course		
Increased stimulation, understanding, awareness and sensitivity	128	66.3
Credit	39	20.2
Background information; knowledge	36	18.7
Personal satisfaction and development	23	11.9
Appreciation for educational television	6	3.1
Other	2	1.0

[a] Many students gave more than one response. The figures, therefore, do not sum to 100%.

Viewers' Demographic Data

Table 3 gives some descriptive data on the 78 nonstudent volunteers who completed the viewers' mid-year evaluation questionnaire. The nonstudent respondents for the final questionnaire included four persons not in this group, but the two groups overlap so much in membership that they can be assumed to be the same.

As might be expected the nonstudent group was somewhat older than the students. The nonstudents also varied much more in age, ranging from 13 to 69 years. There was a considerably greater percentage of males among the nonstudents. While there was a good deal of variability in educational background among the nonstudents, they were, on the whole, a highly educated group: Almost a third (28%) were university graduates, and 64% had some post-secondary education. Most (60%) of the nonstudent volunteers were engaged in other educational activities (e.g., university extension courses, general interest courses), while some 75% indicated that they were engaged in other activities related to communications (e.g., reading, working on photography, discussion groups, performing). Occupationally, the nonstudent group (which included a few students not formally enrolled in Arts 100) contained significant numbers of professionals, technicians and skilled tradesmen, clerical workers, and people involved in television (performers and producers).

Most of the volunteers watched the series on channel 19 (90%), on black and white TV (59%), alone (74%), and quite regularly (65% watched all or almost all broadcasts). They tended to be moderate TV watchers (just over two hours per day on average) and three quarters of them watched other "educational" TV programmes. All these characteristics suggest that our nonstudent group was not typical of the general population. Since they were volunteers,

Table 3

Demographic Data -- Nonstudent Viewers
(78 Completing Mid-Year Evaluation Questionnaire)

Question	Number[a]	Percent
Age		
Up to 20	12	16.2
21 - 25	16	21.6
26 - 30	15	20.3
31 - 40	15	20.3
41 - 50	10	13.5
51 - 60	5	6.8
Over 60	1	1.4
Mean	33.0	
Median	28.4	
S.D.	13.6	
Sex		
Male	55	70.5
Female	23	29.5
Occupation		
Student	16	20.5
Teacher	11	14.1
Housewife	11	14.1
Clerical	9	11.5
Professional	8	10.3
Technician/Skilled trades	8	10.3
TV-related	4	5.1
Sales	3	3.8
Other	8	10.3
Highest level of education completed		
Up to grade 8	2	2.6
Grades 9 - 11	7	9.0
Grade 12	12	15.4
Grade 13	7	9.0
Community College, etc.	9	11.5
Some university	12	15.4
University graduate	22	28.2
Other	7	9.0
Other educational activities?		
Yes	47	60.3
No	31	39.7

Table 3 - (Cont'd)

Question	Number[a]	Percent
Other activities related to communications?		
Yes	58	76.3
No	18	23.7
How did you hear about the programme?		
TV listings	20	25.6
TV advertisement	18	23.1
Newspaper	17	21.8
Friend	9	11.5
Other	14	17.9
What channel do you watch on?		
19 UHF	39	50.0
19 Cable	31	39.7
13 VHF	1	1.3
13 Cable	7	9.0
Do you watch on:		
Black and white TV	46	59.0
Colour TV	29	37.2
Both	3	3.8
Alone or with others?		
Alone	58	74.4
Others	17	21.8
Both	3	3.8
How regularly do you watch?		
Every week	31	40.3
Miss occasional one	19	24.7
3 out of 4 weeks	12	15.6
Half of them	9	11.7
Less than half	6	7.8
Time spent watching TV		
Mean	128.4 minutes/day	
S.D.	87.4	
Watch other "educational" TV?		
Yes	58	75.3
No	9	11.7
Occasionally	10	13.0

[a]Some respondents failed to answer the odd question; so the numbers of responses vary a little from question to question.

they were probably also not typical of the whole Arts 100 viewing audience. We cannot determine this, so it must simply be recognized that our sample of viewers may be highly select.

Viewers' Programme Expectations

The nonstudents provided a variety of reasons for viewing Arts 100, including particular interest in the mass media, relevance to occupation and enjoyment (see Table 4). The largest proportion of viewers expressed a concern with the mass media either through general interest or through their own work. In stating what they had hoped to obtain (in retrospect) they gave answers quite similar to those cited as the reasons for viewing. The item asking what they were getting so far suggests that the programmes were successful in meeting their expectations and that this occurred fairly early in the series. This result was to have been expected since these volunteers were the viewers who had decided to continue watching the programmes and this decision would only have been made if Arts 100 was largely meeting their expectations.

Weekly Activity Sheet

The Weekly Activity Sheet, included as Appendix B, was sent out for four weeks (November 15, 22, 29 and December 6) to a different group of students each week. Results from this questionnaire are presented in Table 5. Data from the four weeks have been combined into a single analysis and, in addition, the ratings of the notes on different lectures, different audio tapes, and various chapters of the text have been collapsed into overall ratings for the lectures, tapes and the text respectively for

Table 4

Viewers' Reasons for Watching Broadcasts, etc. (N=78)

	No. Viewers Stating	% of Viewers Responding[a]
Reasons for watching broadcasts		
Interest in communication and mass media	48	61.5
Further education/relevance to occupation	22	28.2
Increased knowledge; awareness; intellectual stimulation	15	19.2
Enjoyment; entertainment	10	12.8
Self-enlightenment; self-improvement	4	5.1
Other	8	10.3
Hope to get out of the broadcasts		
Factual knowledge; understanding; awareness	48	61.5
Fresh viewpoint; new ideas	15	19.2
Self-enlightenment; self-improvement	8	10.3
Enjoyment; entertainment; stimulation	5	6.4
Preparation for further education	4	5.1
Other	5	6.4
Getting out of the broadcasts so far[b]		
Factual knowledge; understanding; awareness	48	61.5
Fresh viewpoint; new ideas	15	19.5
Enjoyment; entertainment; stimulation	9	11.5
Self-enlightenment; self improvement	9	11.5
Other	9	11.5

[a] Many viewers gave more than one response, so the figures sum to more than 100%.
[b] These responses were given at about the halfway point of the series.

Table 5

Weekly Activity Sheet Information (Four Weeks Combined)

Activity	Evaluation[b] Mean	S.D.	Percent Reporting[c]	Time Spent On[d] Mean	S.D.
TV Lecture	4.71	1.35	88.8	38.1	19.9
Phoned In	3.11	1.90	8.4	--	--
Notes on Lecture	4.79	1.26	72.0	32.0	37.1
Audio Tapes	5.15	1.34	36.4	23.6	37.4
Notes on Audio Tapes	4.30	1.59	34.1	13.0	28.5
Textbook	4.90	1.01	63.6	39.8	50.4
Assigned Reading	5.31	1.51	36.4	49.3	100.3
Preparing Assignments[a]	--	--	72.2	174.2	204.7
Attended Seminars[a]	--	--	71.3	35.9	65.4
Other Related Activities	5.47	1.38	28.0	24.9	74.7

[a]The ratings of assignments and seminars have been excluded for reasons given in the procedure section of the report (pp. 5, 25).

[b]Based upon seven point scale, ranging from "little or no value" (1) to "extremely worthwhile" (7).

[c]108 Weekly Activity Sheets were returned. These figures refer to students reporting that activity during the particular week surveyed.

[d]Minutes per week of all students surveyed (time of 0 recorded where activity was not reported engaged in).

each student. Detailed analyses for particular chapters or tapes involve sample sizes too small to be reliable. The items in Part III of the Weekly Activity Sheet, involving evaluation of assignments and seminars, were inappropriately responded to by some students (see page 5) and have been left out of the table.

The ratings in Table 5 refer to the students' estimates of the value of each activity on a seven-point scale from "Little or No Value" (1) to "Extremely Worthwhile" (7), with the intervening points (2-6) not labelled. Thus, a rating of 4 represents a neutral position. On this basis most of the course components were seen to be of some value with the unassigned related readings (5.31) and other activities (5.47) seen as most worthwhile. However, only about a third of the students were engaged in those voluntary activities during the weeks sampled. Since these activities were optional one might expect them to be rated as worthwhile. Only the post-lecture, phone-in procedure received a negative rating (3.11). It appears that this feedback procedure was not serving a particularly useful purpose and in fact, was not being used (8% of the students reported phoning in). As well, the notes on the audio tapes received only a slightly positive rating. Here too, only one third of the students reported using the audio tape or the notes. The different components of the course are discussed in greater detail later.

It is interesting that 71.3% of the students reported attending a seminar during this period. Since later attendance was substantially less, it appears that students initially attended the seminars, but stopped going because they did not find them worthwhile. This point is considered

This document was processed for the ERIC Document Reproduction Service by the ERIC Clearinghouse at Stanford. We are aware that some pages probably will not be readable in microfiche or in Hardcopy form. However, this is the best available copy, and we feel that the document should not be withheld from interested readers on the basis of these unreadable pages alone.

at length later.

Table 5 also indicates the time spent on the course-related activities during the four week period. There was considerable variability in the time spent on the course by different students. The major consumer of time was the assignments. The average for all course components was just over seven hours per week (430.7 minutes), but the standard deviation was five and one half hours (330.7 minutes). This finding is consistent with the comments of the students: Some reported spending almost no time on the course, others reported a considerable amount of time spent.

The weekly Activity Sheet also showed that 67% of the students watched the televised lecture once, 25% watched it twice, and 8% three or more times per week. The comments confirm that the repeated broadcasts of the same lectures appears to be useful to many of the students.

Finally a few (12-14%) of the students reported picture and/or sound reception that was not normal, but these slight distortions in reception did not affect the evaluation of the TV lectures.

Mid-Year Evaluation Questionnaires

1. Students. Results of the mid-year evaluation for the 109 registered students who returned completed questionnaires in time to be included are summarized in Table 6. The questionnaire used was very similar to the final evaluation questionnaire (See appendix C and p. 8 of this report). The first 14 items had 5 alternatives per item and were scored from 1 through 5, with 5 representing the most positive position and a value of 3 representing a somewhat neutral position. In general, at about the halfway point in the course, there was a positive feeling that the course was meeting the students' personal expectations

Table 6

Mid-Year Evaluation Results

Question[a]		All Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Nonstudent Viewers
1. Is course meeting your personal expectations?	Mean	3.36	3.01	4.21*	--[b]
	S.D.	1.13	1.05	0.83	
	N	108	77	28	
2. Is course meeting its stated objectives?	Mean	3.75	3.58	4.11*	--
	S.D.	0.90	0.91	0.75	
	N	108	73	27	
3. How would you rate Arts 100 overall?	Mean	3.33	3.09	3.89*	4.01**
	S.D.	1.06	0.96	1.07	0.69
	N	108	77	28	78
4. Would you recommend course to a friend?	Mean	[illegible]	3.38	4.21*	--
	S.D.	0.98	0.99	0.79	
	N	109	78	28	
5. How interesting is course?	Mean	3.41	3.19	3.93*	3.99**
	S.D.	1.05	1.01	0.94	0.76
	N	109	78	28	78
6. How would you rate Arts 100 in comparison with other courses?	Mean	3.49	3.23	4.13*	--
	S.D.	1.11	1.05	0.99	
	N	100	73	24	
7. Is time devoted well spent?	Mean	3.79	3.67	4.11*	--
	S.D.	0.82	0.80	0.79	
	N	109	78	28	
8. Does it stimulate intellectual curiosity?	Mean	3.29	3.08	3.79*	3.85**
	S.D.	1.15	1.09	1.13	0.87
	N	108	77	28	74
9. Worth of TV lectures.	Mean	3.32	3.15	3.71*	--
	S.D.	1.09	1.08	1.01	
	N	109	78	28	

Table 6 - (Cont'd)

Question[a]		All Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Nonstudent Viewers
10. Worth of textbook.	Mean	3.44	3.35	3.67	--
	S.D	0.90	0.94	0.78	
	N	107	77	27	
11. Worth of seminars.	Mean	2.55	2.39	3.04*	--
	S.D.	1.20	1.16	1.27	
	N	103	75	25	
12. Worth of assignments.	Mean	3.54	3.35	4.00*	--
	S.D.	1.06	1.02	1.02	
	N	107	78	26	
13. Worth of lecture notes.	Mean	3.92	3.91	3.93	--
	S.D	0.87	0.87	0.90	
	N	109	81	28	
14. Worth of audio tapes.	Mean	3.35	3.20	3.58	--
	S.D.	1.16	1.21	0.90	
	N	84	56	26	
15. Any effect in what you do, think, feel, etc.?	Yes	67 (63.2%)			45 (63.4%)
	No	39 (36.8%)			26 (36.6%)
16. (A) Average time spent on course.	Mean	188.2 mins./week	157.3	265.2*	
	S.D.	140.6	97.9	193.8	
	N	102	74	25	
(B) In comparison with other courses.	More	12 (11.9%)			
	Same	40 (39.6%)			
	Less	49 (48.5%)			

[a]These are abbreviated forms of the actual questions.
[b]No comparable question was included in the nonstudent questionnaire.
*Difference between full- and part-time students significant at .05 level.
** Difference between all students and nonstudent viewers significant at .05 level.

and its own stated goals. Overall, the first half of Arts 100 was rated between good and very good and a little above average when compared with other full courses the students were taking.

Arts 100 was rated as interesting (3.41), intellectually stimulating (3.29), and being worth the time spent on it (3.79). The different components of the course, TV lectures, text, assignments, etc., were all seen as worthwhile with the notes on the lectures receiving the highest rating. The exception here was the monthly seminars which received a rating of only 2.55.

A high percentage (63%) of the students felt that, in addition to course content, the first half of Arts 100 had already influenced their behaviour in some way -- that it had resulted in increased awareness, a different manner of thinking, greater scepticism, etc. on their part.

On the mid-year questionnaire the students reported spending an average of three hours on the course. (Most of them felt that this was about the same time as was being spent on other courses.) However, on the Weekly Activity Sheet the students reported an average of 7 hours on the course -- more than twice as much! The two sets of time estimates are significantly correlated ($r=.45$, $N=68$, $p<.001$), but the agreement is not very high. We are unable to fully explain the discrepancy (but see p. 21), and are inclined to accept the responses to question 16(B) as being the most accurate. For most students Arts 100 was no more time-consuming than their other courses and for almost half the students it was less time-consuming.

The mid-year questionnaire also asked the students to indicate what they had found to be the most- and least-valuable aspects of the course. In order of frequency, the most valuable aspects were seen to be: TV

lectures (18%), assignments (16%), OECA workshop (10%), convenience (10%), The New Literacy (9%), the lecture notes (7%), feedback from Professor Gordon (7%), the audio tapes (6%) and the outside readings (4%). More general aspects of the course were also mentioned: increased awareness and understanding (10%), opportunity for self-evaluation (10%), and individual freedom in learning (6%).

Least valuable were seen to be the seminars (32%), the TV lectures (11%), audio tapes (10%), assignments (8%), the material on the senses (6%) and the hot line (3%). The lack of personal contact was mentioned as least valuable by 7% of the students.

As often happens with such evaluations things that some students saw as most valuable, others saw as least valuable. By and large, though, these data support the evaluative ratings On the negative side two things stood out. First, fully a third of the students said that the seminars were the least valuable part of the course. Second, a number of students mentioned the impersonal nature of the course.

Table 6 also presents some interesting differences between the reactions of the full-time and part-time students. The part-time students gave higher ratings for all items, statistically significant differences in all but three cases. On the comparable items the part-time students gave ratings quite similar to those of the nonstudent viewers. On the mid-year evaluation, then, Arts 100 was much better received by the part-time students (and the nonstudent viewers) than by the full-time students. This difference was not due to the fact that the viewers and part-time students, who were older and more mature, were in general more appreciative of university courses since the part-time students rated Arts 100 as "better than most" when compared with other courses they were taking

or had taken.

2. Nonstudent Viewers. The mid-year evaluation data from the 78 nonstudent viewers of Arts 100 appear in Table 7. This group rated the first half of Arts 100 as very good (4.01). When compared with other general TV fare and "educational" television, Arts 100 was considered better than most. It was rated as quite interesting, quite informative, and quite intellectually stimulating. About 63% of the nonstudent viewers stated that the course has influenced their behaviour in terms of increased awareness, greater scepticism, etc. The responses to this item were very similar to those of the students.

Table 7

Nonstudents' Mid-Year Evaluation

Question[a]		N[b]	Mean	S.D.
14. How would you rate Arts 100 overall?		78	4.01	0.69
15. How does it compare with other TV programmes?		76	4.15	0.86
16. How does it compare with other "educational" TV?		72	4.11	0.85
17. How interesting?		78	3.99	0.76
18. How informative?		72	3.99	0.74
19. How intellectually stimulating?		74	3.85	0.87
20. Any effect?	Yes	45 (63.4%)		
	No	26 (36.6%)		

[a]These are abbreviated versions of the actual questions asked.

[b]Some viewers did not answer all questions.

Comments on the open-ended questions concerning viewers' opinions about most and least valuable aspects of Arts 100 fall readily into two large categories: (1) general statements about the course, and (2) specific comments referring to particular components or aspects of it. Almost half the viewers cited as most valuable the information, increased awareness and understanding, and intellectual stimulation provided by the course. These outcomes were similar to the reasons for watching and expectations discussed earlier and suggests that the course was meeting the wishes of this group of viewers. There were very few general comments regarding the least valuable aspects of the course. As with the students, lack of personal contact was mentioned by 6% of the group and another 4% felt that too much material was covered.

Among the specific comments, the puppet received support as both the most (10%) and also the least valuable (19%) aspect. The most common positive statement concerned the use of film clips and aids (23% found this most valuable, although 8% found this aspect least valuable). On the negative side, 13% were critical of the use of academic language. Both of these items appeared as specific items on the final evaluation questionnaire, and are discussed again later.

Table 6 shows the responses of students and nonstudents to four items from the mid-year evaluation questionnaires which were comparable. On the three evaluative items the nonstudents were clearly more positive and less variable in their ratings than the full-time students. The nonstudents' reactions were quite similar to those of the part-time students. For the item concerning behavioural effects of the course the results of the nonstudents and all students were almost identical, with a high percentage responding yes in both groups.

In summary, then, the first half of the course and most of its components were moderately well-received by the students and very well-received by the nonstudent volunteers. Among the students, those who were part-time rated the course better than did the full-time. The ratings of the part-timers were very similar to those of the nonstudent viewers. The ratings of these older and perhaps more mature groups, part-time students and nonstudent viewers, constitute very good interim reviews for Arts 100. The reactions of the full-time students, while on the positive side, suggested that there is more room for improvement.

Final Evaluation Questionnaire

1. Students. As stated previously about one-half of the students in the course took part in the final evaluation (N=145). The results of the Final Evaluation Questionnaire for students are given in Table 8. The responses for all students as well as a breakdown for full-time and part-time students are included. As at mid-year, the part-time students gave higher evaluations that did the full time students. To place these ratings in perspective the mean rating for 30 Psychology Department courses are given in Table 8 for four comparable items. In each case the Psychology ratings are higher than those of the full-time, but lower than those of the part-time Arts 100 students' ratings. In fact, the part-time students' ratings are comparable to the ratings of the top courses in Psychology, while the full-time students would clearly place Arts 100 in the lower half of the distribution of Psychology courses. A problem interpreting this comparison results from the fact that these 30 Psychology courses cannot be considered as a representative sample of Arts Faculty courses. They are probably among the better courses in the Arts Faculty. (Psychology courses at the University

Table 8

Students' Final Evaluation Results

(Nonstudent Viewers' and Psychology Course Ratings
Included for Some Comparable Items)

Question[a]		All Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Nonstudent Viewers	Psychology Courses[b]
1. Has course met your personal expectations?	Mean	[illegible]	3.23	4.24*		
	S.D.	[illegible]	0.93	0.80		
	N	145	74	71		
2. Has course met its stated objectives?	Mean	4.11	3.84	4.38*		
	S.D.	0.85	0.89	0.71		
	N	[illegible]	69	68		
3. How would you rate Arts 100 overall?	Mean	3.80	3.37	4.25*	3.98	3.64
	S.D.	[illegible]	1.06	0.88	0.72	
	N	144	74	70	79	
4. Would you recommend course to a friend?	Mean	4.12	3.84	4.41*	4.42**	4.03
	S.D.	0.96	1.07	0.75	0.57	
	N	144	73	71	78	
5. How interesting was the course?	Mean	3.74	3.30	4.20*	3.91	3.81
	S.D.	1.01	0.98	0.84	0.70	
	N	145	74	71	80	
6. How would you rate Arts 100 in comparison with other courses?	Mean	3.67	3.46	4.00*		
	S.D.	0.96	0.96	0.86		
	N	119	72	47		
7. Was time devoted well spent?	Mean	3.90	3.61	4.21*		
	S.D.	0.77	0.77	0.63		
	N	145	74	71		

Table 8 - (Cont'd)

Question[a]		All Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Nonstudent Viewers	Psychology Courses[b]
8. Did it stimulate intellectual curiosity?	Mean	3.88	3.43	4.34*	3.99	
	S.D.	1.05	1.04	0.84	0.71	
	N	145	74	71	79	
9. How understandable were the lectures?	Mean	3.67	3.50	3.86*	3.75	3.74
	S.D.	0.85	0.85	0.82	0.81	
	N	144	74	70	79	
11. Worth of textbook.	Mean	3.67	3.36	3.99*		
	S.D.	1.04	1.09	0.89		
	N	144	73	71		
12. Worth of seminars.	Mean	2.68	2.31	3.09*		
	S.D.	1.16	1.04	1.14		
	N	137	72	65		
13. Worth of assignments.	Mean	3.81	3.42	4.22*		
	S.D.	1.08	1.10	0.91		
	N	141	72	69		
14. Worth of TV lectures.	Mean	3.72	3.41	4.04*		
	S.D.	1.03	1.07	0.87		
	N	145	72	71		
15. Worth of lecture notes.	Mean	4.18	4.07	4.30		
	S.D.	0.85	0.94	0.73		
	N	144	74	70		
16. Worth of audio tapes.	Mean	3.45	3.20	3.62		
	S.D.	1.21	1.19	1.20		
	N	118	49	69		

Table 8 - (Cont'd)

Question[a]		All Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Nonstudent Viewers	Psychology Courses[b]
17. Worth of OECA workshop.	Mean	4.15	4.04	4.26		
	S.D.	1.15	1.23	1.06		
	N	96	50	46		
18. Effect of puppet on TV lectures.	Mean	3.94	3.61	4.28*	3.87	
	S.D.	1.29	1.27	1.01	1.28	
	N	147	72	69	78	
21. Effect of illustrative materials.	Mean	4.32	4.45	4.20	4.52	
	S.D.	0.95	0.69	1.15	0.81	
	N	145	74	71	79	
22. How format compares with "standard".	Mean	4.[illegible]	3.80	[illegible]		
	S.D.	1.06	1.04	0.85		
	N	125	69	56		
10. Amount of material covered in lectures.	Too much	25 (17.7%)	18 (25.4%)	7 (10.0%)	11 (14.5%)	
	About right	100 (70.9%)	45 (63.4%)	55 (78.6%)	54 (71.1%)	
	Too little	16 (11.4%)	8 (11.3%)	8 (11.4%)	11 (14.5%)	
19. Use of "academic" language.	Too much	47 (33.3%)	35 (48.6%)	12 (17.4%)*	12 (15.6%)**	
	About right	91 (64.5%)	36 (50.0%)	55 (79.7%)	63 (81.8%)	
	Too little	3 (2.2%)	1 (1.4%)	2 (2.9%)	2 (2.6%)	
20. Time prof. was on camera.	Too much	21 (14.9%)	15 (21.4%)	6 (8.5%)*	19 (24.1%)	
	About right	115 (81.6%)	55 (78.6%)	60 (84.5%)	56 (70.9%)	
	Too little	5 (3.5%)	0 (00.0%)	5 (7.0%)	4 (5.1%)	
23. Did "hot line" meet your needs.	Yes	37 (25.5%)	11 (14.9%)	26 (36.6%)		
	No	9 (6.2%)	3 (4.1%)	6 (8.5%)		
	Didn't use	99 (68.3%)	60 (81.1%)	39 (54.9%)		

Table 8 - (Cont'd)

Question[a]		All Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Nonstudent Viewers	Psychology Courses[b]
24. Reading materials accessible enough.	Yes	76 (62.3%)	43 (74.1%)	33 (51.6%)*		
	No	46 (37.7%)	15 (25.9%)	31 (48.4%)		
25. Any effect in what you do, think, feel, etc.?	Yes	120 (86.3%)	54 (77.1%)	66 (95.7%)*	55 (72.4%)**	
	No	19 (13.7%)	16 (22.9%)	3 (4.3%)	21 (27.6%)	
26. (A) Average time spent on course?	Mean	201.21 mins.	142.93	262.16*		
	S.D.	165.43	67.55	210.35		
	N	137	70	67		
(B) In comparison with other courses?	More	22 (18.5%)	4 (5.6%)	18 (37.5%)*		
	Same	40 (33.6%)	24 (33.8%)	16 (33.3%)		
	Less	57 (47.9%)	43 (60.6%)	14 (29.2%)		

[a]Questions are abbreviated and slightly rearranged for better tabular presentation. Actual questions are given in Appendix C.

[b]These means were computed across 30 Psychology courses ranging from large lecture to small seminar classes. Since it is difficult to suggest which of these courses in any way functions as an appropriate comparison group for Arts 100, only the overall means are presented.

*Differences between full-time and part-time students' ratings are significant beyond the .05 level.

**Differences between nonstudents' and all students' ratings are significant beyond the .05 level.

of Waterloo tend to have a good reputation among the students.)

Table 8 also includes nonstudent viewers' ratings for several comparable items. (Complete results for nonstudents' final evaluations are in Table 10.) In general, the viewers' were not significantly different from the ratings of all students (full- and part-time combined). However, if we look at the general evaluative items (questions 3, 4, 5, 8, 9), in each case the nonstudents' mean is closer to the part-time than the full-time students. Thus, both the part-time students and the nonstudent viewers were more enthusiastic about Arts 100 than were the full-time students, whose ratings were moderately positive.

Again, the only clearly negative aspect was the seminars, although the part-time students did give them a rating of "worthwhile". Clearly, this aspect of the course requires considerable reworking. The comments on this item shed some light on the problem. There was apparently considerable variability in the performance of different seminar leaders. Comments ranged from "no direction to or from the seminar leader" to "leader was most helpful". Also several comments suggest a desire for more structure in the seminars. A brief training programme for seminar leaders and some degree of direction as to what might be dealt with in particular seminars would help. Experiences like the OECA workshop, which was extremely well received, might replace some of the seminars. Besides weaknesses in the seminars themselves, several administrative difficulties interfered with their operation. Problems were encountered in scheduling rooms for the seminars, and several times students arrived to find the rooms locked. Projectors and audio-visual personnel were not always available when needed. These problems may well have played a part in "turning off" the full-time students. The data do not suggest doing away with the seminars. Many students expressed a need for "personal

contact" and others -- part-timers especially -- did find the seminars useful.

The only other aspect of questionable worth was the audio tapes. Overall, they were rated as adequate, but several comments suggest that the tapes on the assignments were worthwhile, while the others were of little value.

The other specific components (text, TV lectures, lecture notes, etc.) were quite well received by the students and the comments made reflect these high ratings. Several comments on the assignments referred to them as challenging, difficult or time-consuming. This was meant as praise since the students seemed to feel that much was learned from the assignments. The question about the puppet generated a large number of comments ranging from "insulting to my intelligence" to "very, very effective" with more of the comments in the latter category. "I must admit that Thomas helped by frequently asking just what was on my mind" represents the content of several of the comments and explains the high rating received.

The amount of material covered in the lectures and the amount of time Professor Gordon was on camera seemed about right to the students. There was too much "academic" language according to a sizeable number of students, particularly full-time students. It is interesting that the full-time students who were ordinarily much more exposed to academic language than the part-time or nonstudents should have complained of this. Perhaps they expected Arts 100 to be different. In any event, the comments here were quite varied ranging from "sometimes it seemed like too much jargon" to "it stimulated me and made me sharpen my own language".

The difficulty with the "hot line" was simply that most students did not use it. The comments indicate that they felt no need to. Most

of those who did phone in felt their needs were met. Accessibility of reading materials appeared to be a problem for a large number of part-time students -- no doubt those living outside the Kitchener-Waterloo area. It should be relatively simple to solve this problem through arrangements with local public libraries.

A large proportion of the students reported that Arts 100 had an effect on them. In general, they felt an increased awareness and a more critical view of the mass media.

The part-time students tended to put more time into Arts 100 (roughly 4 hours/week) than the full-time students (about 2 hours/week), many of whom found Arts 100 less time-consuming than their other courses. It is likely that the part-time students were more highly motivated in Arts 100, consequently spent more time and effort and got more from the course. Their higher evaluations and the fact that the course grades were significantly higher for part-time than for full-time students support this interpretation. The time spent by the two groups might also account for some of the discrepancy between the Weekly Activity Sheet and the Mid-Year Questionnaire results noted earlier: Part-time students made up 31.5% of sample and only 26.5% of the Mid-Year sample.

The comments generated by the open-ended items on most and least valuable aspects of the course are summarized in Table 9. As with the mid-year evaluation, these have been broken into general and specific comments. The most valuable general aspects mainly involved increased awareness of the mass media, information and intellectual stimulation, and self-evaluation. The most valuable specific aspects tended to be those components (assignments, TV lectures, text, workshop,

Table 9

Most and Least Valuable Aspects of Course (Student Comments)

Most Valuable			Least Valuable		
Category	No. Citing	% Citing	Category	No. Citing	% Citing
General			General		
Increased awareness, understanding	21	14.5	Lack of personal contact	4	2.8
Information, knowledge, and intellectual stimulation.	13	9.0	Lacks challenge	2	1.4
Opportunity for self-evaluation, new values, etc.	12	8.3	Too much material to cover	1	0.7
Use of educational TV	9	6.2	Other	1	0.7
Specific			Specific		
Assignments	30	20.7	Seminars	31	21.4
TV lectures	19	13.1	TV lectures	14	9.7
The New Literacy	16	11.0	Audio tapes	12	8.3
OECA Workshop	14	9.7	Assignments	10	6.9
Seminars	13	9.0	Hot line	9	6.2
Assignment feedback	12	8.3	Material on senses and brain	8	5.5
Notes on lectures	11	7.6	Puppet	5	3.5
Reading outside material	9	6.2	Lack of guidance in assign.	3	2.1
Convenience	9	6.2	Section on language	3	2.1
Other	6	4.1	Unecessary repetitions	2	1.4

etc.) which received high ratings on the objective items. The number of students indicating least valuable general aspects was too small to place any interpretation other than that there were very few general complaints about Arts 100. The seminars were again the leading specific complaint.

Finally, a number of students were especially pleased with Professor Gordon's comments on their assignments and his prompt replies to their letters.

2. Nonstudent Viewers. The final evaluation results for the nonstudent viewers (N=80) are presented in Table 10. As stated earlier for the questions that were comparable the nonstudents' ratings were similar to the part-time students and somewhat higher than those of the full-time students. Over 60% of the nonstudents stated that they watched 75% or more of the broadcasts and only 17.5% viewed less than half. This group, then, pretty well stayed with the series. Their evaluative ratings are all quite high, including comparisons with TV in general and "educational" TV. These ratings are summarized by comments like "very well planned -- thought-provoking conclusions" and "of consistently high quality throughout the series". The nonstudents also appeared comfortable with the amount of material, the use of "academic" language, and the amount of time Professor Gordon was on camera. Again the puppet received many comments covering a wide range. Most of them were quite positive like "was fantastic idea" and "many of his questions were my own", but a few viewers were quite annoyed or insulted by the puppet and called it "babyish", "dehumanizing", and "too cute".

Table 10

Nonstudents' Final Evaluation Results

Question[a]	Number	Percent
1. How regularly did you watch the broadcasts?		
(a) every week	17	21.2%
(b) missed occasional one	22	27.5%
(c) about 3 weeks out of 4	11	13.7%
(d) roughly half of them	16	20.0%
(e) less than half of them	14	17.5%

	N	Mean	S.D.
2. How would you rate Arts 100 overall?	79	3.98	0.72
3. How does it compare with other TV programmes?	77	4.22	0.72
4. How does it compare with other "educational" TV?	76	4.24	0.69
5. Would you recommend Arts 100 to a friend?	78	4.42	0.70
6. How interesting?	80	3.91	0.70
7. How informative?	79	3.96	0.65
8. How intellectually stimulating?	79	3.99	0.71
9. How clear were the presentations?	79	3.75	0.81
11. How effective was use of puppet?	78	3.87	1.28
14. How effective were illustrative materials?	79	4.52	0.81

10. How do you feel about the amount of material covered?	Too much	11 (14.5%)
	About right	54 (71.1%)
	Too little	11 (14.5%)

Table 10 - (Cont'd)

Question[a]		Number	Percent
12. How do you feel about the use of "academic" language?	Too much	12	15.6
	About right	63	81.8
	Too little	2	2.6
13. How do you feel about the amount of time Prof. was on camera?	Too much	19	24.1
	About right	56	70.9
	Too little	4	5.1
15. Any effect?	Yes	55	72.4
	No	21	27.6
18. Did you find the broadcast times convenient?	Yes	58	74.4
	No	20	25.6

[a]These are abbreviated versions of the questions asked, slightly rearranged for tabular presentations. Actual questions are in Appendix E.

A large proportion (72%) stated that Arts 100 had an effect on them. Their comments were similar to those of the students, suggesting that most of the effect has been in gaining insight, more critical attitudes toward and more concern with the mass media, as well as an increased awareness of and concern with the accuracy of what they thought, heard or apprehended.

The most valuable general aspects of the programmes (Table 11) were also seen as increased awareness of the media, intellectual stimulation, and self-enlightenment. The most and least valuable specific aspects and the least valuable general aspects were responded to by too few nonstudents to draw any useful conclusions except that the great majority of nonstudents cited (and presumably found) no least valuable aspects.

Table 11

Most and Least Valuable Aspects of Arts 100 (Viewers' Comments)

Most Valuable			Least Valuable		
Category	No. Citing	% Citing	Category	No. Citing	% Citing
General			General		
1. Information, knowledge	20	25.0	1. Too much material	2	2.5
2. Increased understanding of communication	14	17.5	2. Poorly integrated	1	1.3
3. Opportunity for self-evaluation, new values, etc.	8	10.0	3. Other	2	2.5
4. Other	7	8.8	Specific		
Specific			1. Puppet	5	6.3
1. Film clips and aids	5	6.3	2. Illustrations	4	5.0
2. Material on senses	4	5.0	3. Material on senses and the brain	4	5.0
3. Method of presentation	3	3.8	4. Academic language	4	5.0
4. Review opportunity	2	2.5	5. Unnecessary repetitions	3	3.8
5. Material on mass media	2	2.5	6. Time limitation	2	2.5
6. Puppet	2	2.5	7. Material on subliminal media	2	2.5
7. The New Literacy	2	2.5	8. Broadcast times invonvenient.	1	1.3
8. Convenience	1	1.3	9. Theme music	1	1.3
9. Discussion with others	1	1.3	10. Other	2	2.5
10. Gordon's philosophy and conception of reality	1	1.3			

Since half of the nonstudent viewers had been provided with only the lecture notes and the other half with both the lecture notes and the text, The New Literacy, a comparison of their responses to the evaluative items was made. The two groups were almost identical in their ratings. The addition of The New Literacy did not affect viewers' ratings of the series.

Change From Mid-Year to Final Evaluation

1. Students. Table 12 presents the analysis of changes in students' responses from the mid-year to the final evaluation for those items and people in common. Table 13 gives the same data for the non-student viewers. Positive means represent an increase from mid-year to final evaluation. Most of the students' ratings were more positive at the end of the course than at the middle. There were significant changes for overall course rating, recommendation to a friend, stimulation of intellectual curiosity and worth of lecture notes for all students. The only significant decrease in evaluation for students concerned the seminars, indicating that what was already the weakest component in the Arts 100 package became even worse as the year progressed. The tendency for most items to increase in evaluation from mid-year to the end of the course may be explained by several comments which suggested that the later material on the mass media tended to be much more interesting and relevant in the students' opinion than the earlier material on the brain and the senses.

2. Nonstudent Viewers. There were no significant changes in evaluative items for the nonstudents. There was a small but significant

Table 12

Changes[a] from Mid-year to Final Evaluation (Students)

Question		All Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students
1. Has course met your personal expectations?	Mean	.013	.060	-.074
	S.E.	.086	.116	.118
	N	77	50	27
2. Has course met its stated objectives?	Mean	.122	.184	.000
	S.E.	.088	.112	.141
	N	74	49	25
3. How would you rate Arts 100 overall?	Mean	.237*	.180	.346*
	S.E.	.094	.113	.135
	N	76	50	26
4. Would you recommend course to a friend?	Mean	.171*	.204*	.111
	S.E.	.076	.101	.111
	N	76	49	27
5. How interesting was course?	Mean	.091	.060	.148
	S.E.	.070	.092	.103
	N	77	50	27
6. How would you rate Arts 100 in comparison with other courses?	Mean	.000	.083	.222
	S.E.	.097	.115	.173
	N	66	48	18
7. Was time devoted well spent?	Mean	-.013	.020	-.074
	S.E.	.086	.116	.118
	N	77	50	27
8. Did it stimulate intellectual curiosity?	Mean	.408*	.306*	.593*
	S.E.	.103	.121	.187
	N	76	49	27

Table 12 - (Cont'd)

Question		All Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students
9. Worth of textbook.	Mean	.117	.160	.037
	S.E.	.098	.122	.164
	N	77	50	27
10. Worth of seminars	Mean	-.240*	-.180	-.360
	S.E.	.107	.133	.181
	N	75	50	25
11. Worth of assignments	Mean	.149	.082	.280
	S.E.	.094	.116	.158
	N	74	49	25
12. Worth of TV lectures	Mean	.195	.230	.111
	S.E.	.101	.128	.144
	N	77	50	27
13. Worth of lecture notes	Mean	.221*	.280*	.111
	S.E.	.095	.121	.154
	N	77	50	27
14. Worth of audio tapes	Mean	-.228	-.219	-.240
	S.E.	.158	.245	.185
	N	57	32	25
15. Average time spent on course	Mean	-22.181	-40.521	14.500
	S.E.	23.85	29.08	41.55
	N	72	48	24

[a]Positive change means more positive evaluation at end of course than at mid-year.

*Change from mid-year to final is statistically significant beyond .05 level.

Table 13

Changes[a] from Mid-Year to Final Evaluation (Viewers)

Question		Change
1. How regularly do you watch broadcasts?[b]	Mean	-.699*
	S.E.	.108
	N	73
2. How would you rate Arts 100 overall?	Mean	-.081
	S.E.	.076
	N	74
3. How would you rate Arts 100 in comparison with other TV programmes?	Mean	.014
	S.E.	.079
	N	71
4. How would you rate Arts 100 in comparison with "educational" TV?	Mean	.116
	S.E.	.091
	N	69
5. How interesting was programme?	Mean	-.068
	S.E.	.087
	N	74
6. How informative was programme?	Mean	-.114
	S.E.	.078
	N	70
7. How intellectually stimulating did you find the programmes?	Mean	.114
	S.E.	.088
	N	70

[a] Positive change means more positive evaluation at end of course than at mid-year.

[b] For this analysis 5 represents most regular viewing, and a negative change reflects a decrease in viewing regularity.

* Change from mid-year to final is statistically significant beyond .05 level.

decrease in the regularity of viewing, but this is probably explained by a regression to the mean phenomenon. That is, this sample was originally obtained from those who were highly regular viewers. Some decrease in viewing on the part of this extreme group would be expected. As indicated previously, the nonstudents viewing habits were quite regular throughout the series.

Examination

Results of the examination for students and for three comparison groups are given in Table 14. The examination, consisting of three open-ended questions, was not a part of the course; it was developed specifically and used only for the purposes of the evaluation project. The examination and the scoring key are in Appendix F. Scoring of the exam was done "blind" (that is, without knowledge of whose exam was being scored) and was highly reliable. It should be noted that absolute scores on the exam have no meaning since its difficulty level is unknown; only relative scores can be interpreted. A comparison of full-time and part-time students indicated no difference in performance on the examination, so only the distribution for all students is given. The Introductory Psychology and extension course comparison groups had been selected because they were somewhat comparable to the full-time and part-time students, respectively. These two comparison groups did not differ from each other, but both were significantly below the students in examination performance. Further, 42% of Arts 100 students scored above 12 while only 5% of the two comparison groups did. And, only 10% of the Arts students scored below 7 as compared to 44% of the two comparison groups. These results indicate that at the end of the year Arts 100 students were able to deal with material that other

Table 14

Results of Final Examination

Frequency Distribution	Arts 100 Students (All)[b]	Introductory Psychology	Extension Course	Grade 13
19 - 27	4	0	0	0
16 - 18	11	0	0	1
13 - 15	20	0	3	7
10 - 12	20	6	8	5
7 - 9	20	5	11	3
4 - 6	7	8	15	1
1 - 3	1	1	2	1
Mean	11.84	7.45*	7.72*	11.00
S.D.	4.35	2.91	3.10	4.22
N	83	20	39	18

[a]Examination involved three open-ended items, 10 points per item, for a possible total of 30 points.

[b]There was no difference in the performance of full-time and part-time students.

*Both college level comparison groups had significantly ($p<.05$) lower means than the Arts 100 students.

university students could not handle.

Our third comparison group was actually not included in the original project design, but was, in fact, simply available and was included primarily for exploratory purposes. The grade 13 history students were described by their teacher as a highly motivated, quite bright group (a number of whom were the sons and daughters of University professors) and should not be viewed as a representative sample of grade 13 students. However, it is interesting that this group was not significantly below the Arts 100 students on the examination. The examination did not attempt to measure highly specific course material, but was concerned with adequacy of approach to some problems in communications and mass media and, in these areas at least, it appears that a bright, well-read group of grade 13 students performed as well as students who had completed the course.

For the Arts 100 students correlations were computed between the examination and items on the final evaluation questionnaire (see Appendix G). The examination scores were not significantly correlated with any of the evaluative items or with the average time spent on the course. There was a small positive correlation ($r=.29$, $N=80$, $p<.05$) between the examination and course grades, which were based on the seven course assignments. There is, then, some evidence of exam validity.

The course grades did correlate significantly ($p<.05$) with most of the general evaluation items (correlations ranging from .26 to .48) and with average time per week spent on the course ($r=.33$). The average time per week spent on the course also had similar correlations with the final evaluation items. This general relationship among course grades, average time spent on the course and the evaluative items was

probably a function of a variable not directly measured--motivation or involvement in the course. This interpretation is supported by the fact that the part-time students who spent more time on the course and gave it higher evaluations also obtained higher grades (average slightly better than B+) than did the full-time students (average B).

In summary, the exam results showed that students in Arts 100 were better able to make use of course concepts than were two appropriate comparison groups. A third comparison group, apparently bright and well-read, did as well as the Arts 100 students. To help clarify these results, it would have been interesting to have given the exam to a sample of viewers. Of most importance perhaps was the confirmation that the part-time students who can be assumed to have been more motivated and involved in the course (and who spent more time at it) received better grades and also rated the course more highly.

Mass Media Survey

Results of the Mass Media Survey are given in Appendix K (the questionnaire is found in Appendix D). The survey dealt with any effects that Arts 100 had on use of and attitudes toward the mass media. As has been indicated, the survey was administered to the students, the viewers, and four comparison groups. Some of the comments indicate that this questionnaire was less clear and more difficult to respond to than the other project materials.

The pattern of results of the Mass Media Survey is not very clear and there is a good deal of variability in the data. However, certain trends do emerge: In terms of time spent on each of the media as sources of information, students cited radio, books, TV, newspaper, magazines and movies in that order. The order is essentially the same

for the viewers and comparison groups, with just one reversal in each case. All groups expressed more doubt regarding the accuracy of the media in general than about those parts of each they selected. That "what I watch" was rated as more accurate and objective than "TV in general" and the same was true for the other media. The full- and part-time students and the nonstudent viewers of Arts 100 had similar views regarding the accuracy of the media and these tended to be more sceptical than those of the comparison groups. So, those involved in Arts 100 believed the media to be less objective than those not involved.

Respondents were asked whether there had been any change in use and attitudes in recent months. All groups reported a good deal of change in use (as many as 60% in some groups), but the amount of reported change was about the same for all groups. However, the Arts 100 students and viewers reported much more change in attitudes than did the comparison groups. For example, 64% of the Arts 100 students and 58% of the viewers reported a change in their attitudes toward television. Among the comparison groups only 27% reported such a change. A similar pattern holds for each of the media surveyed. If these reported changes can be accepted as reasonably accurate, it appears that Arts 100 did affect students' and viewers' attitudes and that, in general, they became more critical of the media. At the end of the year the media were seen as "somewhat biased" by the students and viewers of Arts 100.

Conclusions and Implications

Before summarizing and discussing the findings of this study we must note its methodological limitations. These have been mentioned

earlier in this report, but they are important and bear underscoring. First, while our sample of Arts 100 students was large and quite adequate, the nonstudent viewers were a special group of volunteers (an educated, motivated and very interested group), probably not typical of the viewers of the broadcasts. Generalizations from this group to all viewers are highly tentative. Second, there were no pre-course measures on any of the variables. While appropriate comparison groups were used in several cases, they do not quite compensate for the absence of pretests (which we could not carry out because of the timing of this project) and we must be cautious in attributing course "effects." Finally we would remind readers of something which is, perhaps, quite obvious, but is extremely important. Our findings refer only to Arts 100; they do not pertain to other courses offered via television, other "multimedia" courses, or, indeed, any other courses. It would be extremely hazardous to generalize from the positive findings concerning Arts 100 to, say, other educational television courses. With these limitations in mind, let us turn to the major findings and their implications.

Specific Components of Arts 100

Most of the components of the course -- text, lecture notes, TV presentations, OECA workshop, etc., were quite well received by all students. The OECA workshop was extremely well received. More such experiences would be well worthwhile.

The weakest aspect was the seminars. An attempt to better train seminar leaders and to give more direction to the seminars seems warranted. In addition, reducing the administrative problems mentioned

earlier (p. 38) would no doubt help a good deal to counterbalance the feeling of isolation generated by a TV course; the seminars could provide such contact. Further, some students rated the seminars very highly. Presumably they were useful to some students and could be made useful to more of them.

Another weak component was the phone-in system for feedback. However, for those who used it, it was generally viewed as successful. The majority who did not make use of it did not express any need to. Perhaps providing a number to call (at any time) for the few students wanting this kind of feedback would be sufficient.

Some negative reactions were expressed about the first five audio-tapes. The last seven tapes, those dealing with assignments, were seen as quite helpful. This point would be worth following up in subsequent offerings of Arts 100.

For some of the part-time students accessibility of reading materials posed a problem that could easily be solved by better arrangements with local public libraries.

The use of "academic", technical language was a complaint of almost half of the full-time students, but relatively few of the part-time students and viewers. When videotapes are re-done this point should be borne in mind.

General Evaluation of Arts 100

Arts 100 was very well received by the part-time students and nonstudent viewers, who were quite enthusiastic about the course. The full-time students ratings were moderately positive, but somewhat below

the average rating of a comparison group of Psychology courses. For full-time students Arts 100 was just another course. The improved evaluation by the students from mid-year to the end of the course probably reflects greater interest in the material on the mass media in comparison with the material on the brain and the senses. The material on the physiology of the brain and the senses was not well received and could probably be shortened and made more interesting. Conceivably, it could come later in the course when students' interest might be higher and the relevance of the material more obvious.

The regularity of viewing by the nonstudent viewers suggests that Arts 100 is capable of attracting and maintaining an audience of this sort.

Many students watched the lectures more than once and found it useful to be able to do. Broadcasting then several times a week should be continued. A few students and viewers complained that the broadcast times were inconvenient.

Results of the examination indicate that Arts 100 students were more able to deal with material involving communications than were University students in other courses.

From responses to a question concerning effects, comments on the most valuable aspects, and the mass media survey, it seems clear that Arts 100 had attitudinal effects on students as well as nonstudents. Both groups reported more critical views of the media and increased insight into the limitations of the media in attempting to present reality.

In summary, then, the first offering of Arts 100 in this way must be viewed as successful. While a couple of aspects require improvement, the overall evaluation of the course was quite positive.

ARTS 100 EVALUATION PROJECT

General Information Sheet

NAME: _____ STUDENT NUMBER: _____

LOCAL ADDRESS: _____

PHONE NUMBER: _____ BEST TIME TO REACH YOU: _____

AGE: _____ SEX: _____ NATIVE LANGUAGE: _____

OCCUPATION: _____

Highest level of formal education successfully completed (check one):

_____ grade 8 or less
_____ grades 9-11
_____ grade 12
_____ grade 13
_____ community college or equivalent (teachers' college, nursing school, etc.)
_____ some university
_____ other (specify) _____

Note: If not educated in Ontario, reply in terms of Ontario equivalent.

Student status:

_____ full-time student
_____ part-time degree student
_____ non-degree part-time student

How many previous university courses have you completed?

_____ full-year (two semester) courses or equivalent

Did you apply to the University primarily to take Arts 100? _____ Yes; _____ No

Did you enter the University as an "adult" student (a person of mature age who has been away from formal education for at least two years and who does not meet the regular admission requirements)? _____ Yes; _____ No

FACULTY OR PROGRAMME ENROLLED IN (e.g., Engineering, Arts): _____

_____ YEAR: _____

Where (city) do you meet for your monthly seminars? _____

What were your original reasons for taking Arts 100? _____

What do you hope to get out of the course? _____

Do you watch the lectures on: _____ black and white TV, or _____ colour TV

PROJECT CODE NUMBER: _____ WEEK STARTING: Monday

ARTS 100 EVALUATION PROJECT

Weekly Activity Sheet

Please indicate your activities related to Arts 100 and how much time you spent on each during the week indicated above. Below are listed various course-related activities. Indicate which you did and when you did them by putting the times in the appropriate boxes. For example, if you watched a TV lecture from 7:00 to 7:30 Tuesday evening and read The New Literacy from 10:00 to 11:30 Saturday morning, you would put "7-7:30 PM" in the first box of the Tuesday column and "10-11:30 AM" in the sixth box of the Saturday column. Similarly, for the other things you did. Note that there are also spaces to indicate other course-related activities not listed below (e.g., other reading, discussion, etc.).

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY
Watched TV lecture				
Phoned in after TV lecture				
Read notes from lecture				
Listened to audio tapes				
Read notes from audio tapes				
Read The New Literacy				
Read other material related to course				
Attended monthly seminar				
Prepared assignment				
Other (specify) _____				

(Now, please complete other side)

FRIDAY	SATURDAY	SUNDAY

PROJECT CODE NUMBER:_____ WEEK STARTING: Monday_____

ARTS 100 EVALUATION PROJECT

Activity Evaluation Sheet

We would like to get your evaluation of the worth of the various activities related to Arts 100 that you engaged in during the week indicated above. The course-related activities you might have done are listed below. Please indicate how valuable you found each one by circling the appropriate number on the rating scale beside that activity. The more valuable you thought the activity, the higher the number you would circle. Try to make your ratings accurately reflect your evaluation of each specific activity. Indicate the activities you didn't do last week by checking the column at the extreme right.

	Little or No Value						Extremely Worthwhile	Didn't Do Last Week
Saw TV lecture	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	____
Phoned in after lecture	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	____
Read notes from video tapes topics_____ _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	____
Listened to audio tapes								
topic_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	____
topic_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
topic_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
topic_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Read notes from audio tapes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	____
Read The New Literacy								
chapter_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	____
chapter_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
chapter_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Read other material related to course (specify):_____ _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	____
Other relevant activities (specify):_____ _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	____

Part II. Below, please indicate whether the TV reception was "normal" or whether there was something wrong with the:

Picture: _____

Sound: _____

Part III. Now, would you also please evaluate the following aspects of the course (these need not have been done during the past week):

Last completed assignment number _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Seminar most recently attended month _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Do you think your ratings accurately reflect your evaluation of the various course activities? _____ Yes; _____ No

If not, please elaborate. _____

_____

Other comments? _____

_____

APPENDIX C

Student Evaluation Questionnaire

Student status: _____ full-time
_____ part-time degree
_____ non-degree part-time

Did you apply to the University primarily to take Arts 100? _____ yes
_____ no

Were you admitted as a "mature" student (did not meet the University's regular grade 13 admission requirements)? _____ yes; _____ no

Please answer questions 1-22 by circling the letter of the alternative that best answers each question. Place any comments about your answers in the spaces to the right of the alternatives. If an item asks you to evaluate part of the course which you haven't done (e.g., the OECA workshop) or materials you haven't used (e.g., the audio tapes), ignore that item.

1. To what extent has Arts 100 met your personal expectations?

(a) almost completely
(b) to a considerable extent
(c) somewhat
(d) a little
(e) not at all

Comments ...

2. To what extent has Arts 100 met the objectives stated in its brochure?

(a) almost completely
(b) to a considerable extent
(c) somewhat
(d) a little
(e) not at all

Comments ...

3. How would you rate Arts 100 overall?

(a) excellent
(b) very good
(c) good
(d) fair
(e) poor

Comments ...

4. Would you recommend to a friend that he or she take Arts 100?

(a) yes, recommend it highly
(b) yes
(c) don't know
(d) no
(e) definitely not

Comments ...

5. How interesting did you find the course?

(a) extremely interesting
(b) quite interesting
(c) interesting
(d) not very interesting
(e) boring

Comments ...

6. How would you rate Arts 100 in comparison with other university courses?

(a) one of the best
(b) better than most
(c) about average
(d) not as good as most
(e) one of the poorest

Comments ...

7. Do you feel that the time devoted to Arts 100 was well spent?

(a) always
(b) usually
(c) sometimes
(d) seldom
(e) never

Comments ...

8. How intellectually stimulating did you find the course?

(a) highly
(b) quite
(c) somewhat
(d) slightly
(e) not at all

Comments ...

9. How understandable did you find the TV lectures?

(a) extremely understandable
(b) quite understandable
(c) understandable
(d) not very understandable
(e) not at all understandable

Comments ...

10. How do you feel about the amount of material covered in the lectures?

(a) too much
(b) just about right
(c) too little

Comments ...

11. How worthwhile did you find the book "The New Literacy"?

(a) extremely worthwhile
(b) quite worthwhile
(c) worthwhile
(d) of little worth
(e) a waste of time

Comments ...

12. How worthwhile did you find the monthly seminars?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

13. How worthwhile did you find the assignments?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

14. How worthwhile did you find the T.V. lectures?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

15. How worthwhile did you find the notes on the lectures?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

16. How worthwhile did you find the radio tapes?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

17. How worthwhile did you find the OECA TV workshop?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

18. What effect do you think the use of the puppet had on the TV lectures?

(a) considerably aided	Comments ...
(b) somewhat aided	
(c) neither aided nor detracted	
(d) somewhat detracted	
(e) considerably detracted	

19. How do you feel about Professor Gordon's use of "academic" or technical language?

(a) too much of it	Comments ...
(b) just about right	
(c) too little of it	

20. How do you feel about the amount of time Prof. Gordon was on camera?

(a) too much	Comments ...
(b) just about right	
(c) too little	

21. How effective did you find the illustrative materials used in the TV lectures?

(a) considerably aided	Comments ...
(b) somewhat aided	
(c) neither aided nor detracted	
(d) somewhat detracted	
(e) considerably detracted	

22 How do you feel the format of Arts 100 compares with "standard" university course formats?

(a) much better	Comments ...
(b) better	
(c) about as good	
(d) not as good	
(e) much worse	

23(a) Did the "hot line" satisfactorily meet your needs?

_____ yes
_____ no
_____ didn't use

If you checked "no" or "didn't use", please indicate why.

_____

_____

(b). What other arrangements would you like to see for receiving your comments, providing you with help or feedback, etc.?

_____

_____

24. Did you find that secondary reading materials were accessible enough for your needs? _____ yes; _____ no

Please elaborate. _____

_____

25. Beyond providing course content, has Arts 100 had any effect on what you do, think, believe, etc.? ___ yes; _____ no

Please elaborate. _____

_____

_____

26. Roughly how much time per week did you spend on Arts 100 (including TV viewing, reading, preparing assignments, etc.)?

Average time spent per week = _____ hours.

In comparison with other courses Arts 100 took:

_____ more time
_____ about the same amount of time
_____ less time

27. The most valuable aspects of the course were ...

28. The least valuable aspects of the course were ...

29. How would you like to see the course changed?

APPENDIX D

Mass Media Survey

1. On the average how many hours a week do you spend on each of the following media as a source of information?

		Please elaborate ...
(a) TV	_____	
(b) Radio	_____	
(c) Newspapers	_____	
(d) Magazines	_____	
(e) Books	_____	
(f) Movies (not on TV)	_____	
Other: _____	_____	
_____	_____	

2. Below please indicate your opinions regarding how accurate as sources of information the various media are. Do this separately for: (1) the media in general, and (2) your choice from each of them.

		Quite Accurate	Reasonably Accurate	Somewhat Biased	Quite Biased
TV:	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I watch	_____	_____	_____	_____
Radio:	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I listen to	_____	_____	_____	_____
Newspapers:	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I read	_____	_____	_____	_____
Magazines:	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I read	_____	_____	_____	_____
Books:	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I read	_____	_____	_____	_____
Movies (not on TV):	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I watch	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other: _____		_____	_____	_____	_____
_____		_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

3. Has there been any change in your use of these media in recent months?

	Yes	No	Please elaborate:
(a) TV	___	___	_____
(b) Radio	___	___	_____
(c) Newspapers	___	___	_____
(d) Magazines	___	___	_____
(e) Books	___	___	_____
(f) Movies (not on TV)	___	___	_____
Other: _____	___	___	_____
_____	___	___	_____

4. Has there been any change in your opinions of or attitudes toward these media in recent months?

	Yes	No	Please elaborate:
(a) TV	___	___	_____
(b) Radio	___	___	_____
(c) Newspapers	___	___	_____
(d) Magazines	___	___	_____
(e) Books	___	___	_____
(f) Movies (not on TV)	___	___	_____
Other: _____	___	___	_____
_____	___	___	_____

Please write any comments about this questionnaire below. Additional comments about the questionnaire or Arts 100 can be written on the back of this page.

APPENDIX E

Nonstudent Evaluation Questionnaire

Please answer questions 1-14 by circling the letter of the alternative that best answers each question. Place any comments about your answers in the spaces to the right of the alternatives.

1. How regularly did you watch the broadcasts?

(a) every week	Comments ...
(b) missed occasional one	
(c) about 3 weeks out of 4	
(d) roughly half of them	
(e) less than half of them	

2. How would you rate Arts 100 overall?

(a) excellent	Comments ...
(b) very good	
(c) good	
(d) fair	
(e) poor	

3. In comparison with all other programmes you watch on TV, how would you rate Arts 100?

(a) one of the best	Comments ...
(b) better than most	
(c) about average	
(d) not as good as most	
(e) one of the poorest	

4. In comparison with other programmes you watch on "educational" TV, how would you rate Arts 100?

(a) one of the best	Comments ...
(b) better than most	
(c) about average	
(d) not as good as most	
(e) one of the poorest	

5. Would you recommend to a friend that he or she watch Arts 100?

(a) yes, recommend it highly	Comments ...
(b) yes	
(c) don't know	
(d) no	
(e) definitely not	

6. How interesting did you find the programmes?

(a) extremely interesting	Comments ...
(b) quite interesting	
(c) interesting	
(d) not very interesting	
(e) boring	

7. How informative did you find the programmes?

(a) extremely	Comments ...
(b) quite	
(c) somewhat	
(d) slightly	
(e) not at all	

8. How intellectually stimulating did you find them?

(a) highly	Comments ...
(b) quite	
(c) somewhat	
(d) slightly	
(e) not at all	

9. How would you rate the clarity of the presentations?

(a) extremely clear	Comments ...
(b) quite clear	
(c) clear	
(d) not very clear	
(e) not at all clear	

10. How do you feel about the amount of material covered?

(a) too much	Comments ...
(b) just about right	
(c) too little	

11 What effect do you think the use of the puppet had on the programmes?

(a) considerably aided	Comments ...
(b) somewhat aided	
(c) neither aided nor detracted	
(d) somewhat detracted	
(e) considerably detracted	

12. How do you feel about Professor Gordon's use of "academic" or technical language?

(a) too much	Comments ...
(b) just about right	
(c) too little	

13. How do you feel about the amount of time Prof. Gordon was on camera?

(a) too much	Comments ...
(b) just about right	
(c) too little	

14. How effective did you find the illustrative materials used?

(a) considerably aided	Comments ...
(b) somewhat aided	
(c) neither aided nor detracted	
(d) somewhat detracted	
(e) considerably detracted	

15. Beyond providing information, has Arts 100 had any effect on what you do, think, believe, etc.? _____ Yes; _____ No

Please elaborate. _____

_____

_____

16. The most valuable aspects of the broadcasts were ...

17. The least valuable aspects of the broadcasts were ...

18. Did you find the broadcast times convenient? _____ Yes; _____ No

Please elaborate. _____

_____

_____

19. How would you like to see the Arts 100 series changed?

APPENDIX F

Examination

Project Code Number:_____

The questions below deal with the subject of communications. While very long answers could be written to the questions you are asked to answer them briefly in one page or less. This means that you won't be able to elaborate much upon your ideas. You should spend no more than 15 minutes on each question.

1. You are interested in knowing what is happening in the world. You get your information by watching the evening news on TV. What sorts of things would you consider in deciding how accurate this information is?

2. You are interested in knowing how reliable your sense of taste is. How would you go about comparing it with what is "average"?

3. What would you keep in mind in trying to explain things (like snow) to people who are unfamiliar with them (like Arabs)?

Note: Each question appeared on the top of a different page, with the rest of the page (and the back if necessary) available for the answer.

Scoring Manual

The following are actual sample answers chosen from the evaluation examinations which are to be used simply to provide an idea of the scope and quality of answer required for each score. The answers are not necessarily of great depth or clarity. In the case of questions for which more than one point could be awarded, the determination of the actual score was made on the following basis:

1 point - a mention of the concept without elaboration

2 points - inclusion of one aspect or factor with elaboration or of two aspects without elaboration

3 points - inclusion of two aspects with elaboration or three aspects without elaboration.

4 points - inclusion of three aspects with elaboration or of four or more aspects without elaboration.

In every category for which more than one point was awarded several aspects or factors could be included in the answer.

Question #1

Control and Censorship (4 points maximum)

1 point - Does the station which is showing it or the source from where it was received have censorship?

2 points - The first thing which must be considered is whether or not the station, program, announcer or sponsor would have any reason for presenting a biased approach to the subject.

3 points - What type of slant does that station take? How is the station owned, i.e., public, government subsidized or private - Have social slants been seen previously in their broadcasting (e.g., no negroes in the commercials or interviews).

4 points - not awarded. A four point answer could include the control and censorship of station owners, licencers, advertisers and government, with elaboration.

Selectivity (3 points maximum)

1 point - The medium of television has technical limitations which make selection material necessary.

2 points - For instance, if I am shown a scene of a riot and police are presented clubbing three demonstrators, I won't accept this as an example of the clubbing of hundreds of rioters. My understanding of camera angles, lenses, framing etc. also forces me to qualify the material presented for my attention.

3 points - Time limitations resulting in condensation cause selection of certain material. Some stories are scrapped because they cannot be visualized. Stories are passed over or just mentioned because they lack the excitement that most editor's demand of material. Some areas are inaccessible to cameras. There is selectivity in film shots.

Cross reference (2 points maximum)

1 point - I would turn to other newscasts, the newspaper and radio.

2 points - Compare different networks news and the news of other media and relate the report to our own first-hand knowledge of the situation.

Source (authority) (2 points maximum)

1 point - I have to consider what they say they are using as a source for their information

2 points - Never awarded. This would include an elaboration of the above answer.

Other Scorable Answers (1 point each)

Source type: I would have to take into consideration that while seeing an event on television which takes in Siberia, the Siberian problem may not really be intelligible to us.

Personnel bias: I would like to know whether the broadcasters are biased heavily or not. The biases that they have may be projected into the information they give to the public, even though they may be unaware of it and this could radically alter the way the public looks at the situation.

Consideration of audience to which the news is directed: Whether the station is just trying to present what the public wants to hear.

Timeliness: How current is the reporting of a news item.

Balance: Are interviews from both sides of the story given?

Interpretation according to cultural trends: To what extent are facts interpreted in the light of the cultural beliefs of the people reporting to and controlling the media or in the light of the cultural beliefs of the society for whom the news is written.

Commentator and/or reporter image: The announcer's projected image -- does he seem to be factual -- or does he seem to embellish certain news items?

Government policy: What is the government policy toward the country discussed. Is it reflected in the interpretation of the news item.

(3)

Consideration of basic assumptions: What basic assumptions is the station making about a story or about its viewing public.

Presentation: Format of the report (audio-visual etc.)

Station Reputation: History of credibility of the station, i.e., past performance.

Medium: The medium of television is limited as to what it can communicate and the impact it will have.

Question #2

Concept of Standardized Measurement (4 points maximum)

1 point - I would first have to find an objective test with which to measure.

2 points - I should select a certain number of foods and give each of them to a group of people who would tell me how they tasted.

3 points - Choose substances that are known to be sweet, salty, sour and bitter and have a group of people test them and tell me how they taste. Now -- how do they taste to me?

4 points - Basic tastes -- sweet, sour, bitter, salty. With a large number of persons -- have them categorize various foods on a scale as to:

a. very sweet
b. sweet
c. slightly sweet
a. very sour
b. sour
c. slightly sour
a. very bitter
b. bitter
c. slightly bitter
a. very salty
b. salty
c. slightly salty

Now, I, not knowing how the others categorized these foods, would categorize them and compare my results against those of the group of people. Note: This shows how I label foods -- not really how they taste to me.

Comparison with select reference group (4 points maximum)

1 point - I should have to gather a group of people whom I consider average.

2 points - The people I am comparing my taste to -- have they been brought up in the same type of culture etc. that I have -- did they eat "fried potatoes and apple pie" or were they raised on caviar ? Have they been

raised with restrictions similar to mine? Have they been in an anti-alcoholic family?

3 points - First, I would have to decide approximately what I could consider 'average'. I would tend to disregard groups such as 'smokers'. They are obviously not average for their tastes are impaired. Then, I would have to exclude people from other cultures who have developed different taste patterns. I would possibly select as average a group of people who are culturally comparable to me and who do not smoke or use a lot more or less chemicals than I do. Therefore, I would ask questions of and observe people who are living in the same culture and environment as I am.

4 points - The first question is "what is average?". To obtain an average group, I must select from among people who are from my culture, my socio-economic group, maybe from my age group, and who do not have diseases or habits that affect the taste. I would also obtain at least one hundred foods and liquids. Then, with myself in one room and these people in another, we would proceed to taste at predetermined intervals the entire stock and label according to prespecified labels how we thought each particular item tasted. Then, if I agreed with the labelling of this group of people, I would consider myself 'average'.

Other Scorable Answers (1 point each)

Definition of Average: What is average? That is the first stumbling block.

Cross Reference: I would remember taste of something familiar in a certain way, therefore the memory of it would make it taste as I remember it tasted.

Consistency of Taste: Taste seems to be subjective and not always the same for the same foods.

Affecting Factors: Smoking, disease, age -- these have an effect on taste.

Cross-sensory Stimulation: In testing the reliability of taste, I must remember that most of our taste sensations are coupled with our sense of smell and sight.

Concept of the Difference Between the Perception of Taste and the Sensation of it: The way one understands a taste may be different from the taste on the tongue.

Question #3

Analogy (4 points maximum)

1 point - Relate snow to something they are familiar with.

2 points - Base your explanation on something in their own experience (like sand).

3 points - Use of comparisons and analogies. Snow, for instance, can be related to water - a substance known to everybody -- and to sand, something known to the Arabs.

4 points - Empiricism, analogy and regulation all would then come into play. I would compare snow or anything else to something that they are familiar with. For instance, rain. "Snow is like rain, only the drops are frozen into white patters which do not always melt into the ground, but stay piled up on top of it."

Empiricism (3 points maximum)

1 point - They must touch snow. I would take snow to them.

2 points - Pictures or films of snow might help -- also an explanation that it was cold.

3 points - If possible, I would show the ice which forms in a freezer and indicate that snow is close in appearance to this. I could gather pictures of snow from magazines, photos, etc., and augment my explanation with these.

Other Scorable Answers (1 point each)

Gestural Implications or Body Language: By moving my face or body a certain way, I might inadvertently colour my description or their understanding of it.

Common Experience: Even explanations are difficult because there is little common experience on which to base an explanation.

Context: I should be aware that in their living context, snow is incomprehensible.

Regulation (in a common language): We could look up the word snow in a dictionary.

Language Barrier: I must choose my words so that they imply to the Arabs what I mean them to imply.

Clarity of Explanation: Keep the explanation as simple and as concise and clear as possible.

Concept that Basic Assumptions cannot be made: One should keep in mind that their frame of reference would be different from ours, that in describing something we must not let our particular prejudices about snow show.

Empathy: Be understanding and try to feel how they are reacting.

Feedback: I would watch their faces and listen to their verbal reactions to determine if they were understanding me.

APPENDIX C

Intercorrelations

Table 15

Intercorrelations[a] (Students N=145)

Variable	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Expectation	-61*	74*	69*	77*	68*	65*	66*	26*	43*	32*	57*	59*
2. Objectives		59*	61*	58*	47*	47*	56*	24*	33*	29*	44*	46*
3. A:00 overall			77*	77*	74*	72*	66*	29*	50*	29*	56*	60*
4. Rec. to friend				74*	74*	69*	64*	31*	43*	18*	54*	52*
5. Interestingness					72*	67*	73*	28*	56*	34*	49*	66*
6. Vs. other courses						72*	63*	24*	42*	17	51*	56*
7. Time spent well							64*	29*	50*	23*	56*	51*
8. Stimulating								21*	51*	34*	59*	56*
9. Clarity of lectures									27*	03	21*	36*
10. New Literacy										19*	42*	51*
11. Seminars											15	29*
12. Assignments												34*
13. TV lectures												
14. Notes on lectures												
15. Audio tapes												
16. OECA workshop												
17. Effect of puppet												
18. Illustrative material												
19. Format												
20. Behavioural Effect[b]												
21. Time spent												
22. Exam												
23. Course grade												

continued...

Table 15 - (Cont'd)

Intercorrelations[a] (Students N=145)

Variable	14	15	16	17	18	19	20[b]	21	22	23
1. Expectation	30*	21*	25*	35*	12	60*	-38*	33*	10	35*
2. Objectives	20*	08	14	21*	19*	39*	-22*	20*	09	25*
3. Also overall	28*	27*	33*	29*	31*	65*	-40*	36*	06	28*
4. Rec. to friend	27*	07	18	15	26*	65*	-37*	24*	06	36*
5. Interestingness	27*	12	28*	20*	26*	62*	-44*	37*	03	45*
6. Vs. other courses	26*	10	27*	16	20*	69*	-36*	25*	07	36*
7. Time spent well	23*	20*	37*	29*	25*	52*	-33*	34*	-07	25*
8. Stimulating	21*	05	24*	21	17	61*	-36*	30*	-01	33*
9. Clarity of lectures	28*	04	08	01	19*	24*	-15	19*	09	20*
10. New Literacy	19*	21*	21*	14	31*	48*	-22*	32*	07	26*
11. Seminars	-04	27*	26*	24*	03	22*	-20*	28*	-05	18*
12. Assignments	26*	06	33*	17	02	48*	-28*	26*	13	37*
13. TV lectures	39*	21*	28*	36*	30*	59*	-35*	25*	14	19*
14. Notes on lectures		27*	12	16	09	38*	-12	01	13	05
15. Audio tapes			32*	30*	36*	18	-19*	11	00	-01
16. OHTA workshop				35*	14	27*	-07	13	03	08
17. Effect of puppet					18*	21*	05	16	-08	03
18. Illustrative material						25*	-14	11	-02	06
19. Format							-45*	26*	13	35*
20. Behavioural Effect[b]								-13	-01	-21*
21. Time spent									-05	33*
22. Exam										29*
23. Course grade										

[a] Decimals omitted.

[b] Dichotomous variable (yes=1, no=2)

* p<.05.

Table 10

Intercorrelations[a] (Nonstudent Viewers N=8[illegible])

Variable	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12[b]	13[b]
1. Regularity	-03	03	-02	18	06	02	04	-05	02	-03	-09	-22
2. A100 overall		47	27*	49*	58*	49*	46*	30*	18	-07	-07	01
3. A100-TV comparison			49*	30*	29*	41*	34	27*	17	-11	-05	07
4. A100-ETV comparison				25*	27*	38*	34*	19	16	11	-09	11
5. Recommend to friend					50*	24*	40*	15	05	-03	-02	-04
6. Interesting						47*	53*	28*	[illegible]	-01	-22	08
7. Informative							47*	13	20	-16	-09	07
8. Stimulating								20	[illegible]	07	-21	-03
9. Clarity									20	03	-07	17
10. Effect of puppet										-15	-13	-02
11. Effect of illustrative material											12	07
12. Behavioural effect[b]												11
13. Convenience[b]												

[a] Decimals omitted.

[b] Dichotomous variables for which (yes=1, no=2)

* $p<.05$.

APPENDIX H

Mass Media Survey Results

Table 17

Reported Use of Mass Media for Information (Hours/Week)

Mass Media		All Arts 100 Students (N=145)	Full-time Students (N=74)	Part-time Students (N=71)	Nonstudent Viewers (N=80)	Regular Students Comparison Groups[a] (N=106)	Extension Course Comparison Groups[b] (N=39)	All Groups[c]
Information								
Television	Mean	6.58	5.93	7.25	7.50	5.20	3.80	6.23
	S.D.	7.34	6.25	8.32	8.57	7.61	3.20	
Radio	Mean	8.18	10.12	6.17	8.14	6.73	4.49	7.60
	S.D.	12.56	14.31	10.15	12.99	11.25	5.55	
Newspaper	Mean	4.52	4.40	4.64	4.08	2.40	2.63	3.87
	S.D.	6.12	8.02	3.26	5.42	3.28	1.91	
Magazines	Mean	3.00	3.49	2.49	3.09	1.69	1.15	2.60
	S.D.	6.06	8.14	2.45	3.85	1.89	1.23	
Books	Mean	8.08	10.84	5.24	6.81	9.49	5.12	8.00
	S.D.	9.41	11.36	5.61	6.51	12.72	4.96	
Movies	Mean	1.57	2.64	.45	.66	.59	.30	1.13
	S.D.	5.96	8.17	1.04	1.17	1.08	.71	
Other	Mean	2.13	2.24	2.01	2.02	1.52	.13	1.84
	S.D.	7.19	4.92	9.00	6.30	5.92	.66	
All Media	Total time	34.06	39.67	28.25	32.30	27.62	19.62	

[a]The regular students comparison groups includes three psychology courses which contained mostly full-time students.

[b]The extension course comparison group was one social psychology extension course which contained mostly part-time (adult) students.

[c]Means of individual groups weighted by group size.

Table 18

Reported Attitudes Toward Mass Media

Media		All Arts 100 Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Nonstudent Viewers	Regular Students[a] Comparison Groups	Extension Course[b] Comparison Groups	All Groups[c]
Television								
General[d]	Mean	2.36	2.20	2.52	2.13	2.48	2.76	2.38
	S.D.	.79	.81	.75	.80	.85	.55	
	N	133	66	67	70	91	37	
Specific	Mean	2.59	2.51	2.67	2.62	2.73	2.81	2.64
	S.D.	.69	.70	.67	.71	.77	.65	
	N	131	67	64	75	84	31	
Radio								
General	Mean	2.45			2.36		2.84	2.50
	S.D.	.76	.75	.76	.79	.74	.73	
	N	126	64	62	69	94	37	
Specific	Mean	2.55	2.54	2.56	2.75	2.73	2.91	2.65
	S.D	.73	.73	.75	.70	.67	.75	
	N	126	67	59	74	90	34	
Newspaper								
General	Mean	2.12	2.02	2.22	1.91	2.10	2.22	2.09
	S.D.	.84	.86	.81	.80	.85	.72	
	N	134	67	67	70	93	36	
Specific	Mean	2.22	2.23	2.21	2.41	2.16	2.32	2.25
	S.D.	.83	.86	.81	.88	.76	.68	
	N	129	66	63	74	93	34	
Magazines								
General	Mean	2.15	2.15	2.15	2.10	2.13	2.32	2.16
	S.D.	.86	.87	.85	.80	.77	.67	
	N	127	61	66	42	90	37	

Table 18 - (Cont'd)

Media		All Arts [illegible] Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Nonstudent Viewers	Regular Students[a] Comparison Groups	Extension Course[b] Comparison Groups	All Groups[c]
Magazines								
Specific	Mean	2.40	2.39	2.41	2.66	2.51	2.42	2.47
	S.D.	.84	.83	.85	.71	.80	.72	
	N	127	64	63	74	89	31	
Books								
General	Mean	2.63	2.57	2.68	2.48	2.6[illegible]	2.83	2.62
	S.D.	.90	.96	.83	.90	.[illegible]	.88	
	N	128	63	65	65	8[illegible]	36	
Specific	Mean	2.85	2.83	2.87	2.91	2.91	2.97	2.88
	S.D.	.81	.92	.71	.91	.7[illegible]	.85	
	N	128	65	63	72	78	33	
Movies								
General	Mean	1.94	1.98	1.89	1.79	1.86	1.93	1.90
	S.D.	.77	.81	.71	.85	.80	.77	
	N	106	60	46	55	70	28	
Specific	Mean	2.10	2.18	2.00	2.30	2.13	2.04	2.13
	S.D.	.90	.98	.78	.93	.81	.83	
	N	106	62	44	50	71	23	
Other								
General	Mean	1.79	1.85	1.00	2.78	3.00	--	2.08
	S.D.	.80	.80	--	1.48	--		
	N	14	13	1	9	2		
Specific	Mean	2.08	2.00	3.00	2.95	3.00	--	2.34
	S.D.	.95	.95	--	1.30	--		
	N	13	12	1	10	1		

Table 18 - (Cont'd)

Media	All Arts 100 Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Nonstudent Viewers	Regular Students[a] Comparison Groups	Extension Course[b] Comparison Groups	All Groups[c]
All Media[c]							
General	2.27	2.21	2.34	2.15	2.31	2.51	
Specific	2.46	2.44	2.48	2.63	2.53	2.61	

[a]The regular students comparison groups includes three psychology courses which contained mostly full-time students.

[b]The extension course comparison group was one social psychology extension course which contained mostly part-time (adult) students.

[c]Means of individual groups weighted by group size.

[d]General refers to the medium in general (e.g, TV in general). Specific refers to those segments of the medium selected (e.g., "the TV I watch") by the respondent.

[e]Ratings of accuracy of media based on a 4-point scale (1=biased, 4=accurate).

Table 19

Reported Change in Attitudes Toward and Use of Mass Media

Media	All Arts 100 Students	Full-time Students	Part-time Students	Nonstudent Viewers	Regular Students[a] Comparison Groups	Extension Course[b] Comparison Groups
Change in Use			Percent Reporting Change			
TV	50.7	48.6	53.1	55.1	58.8	28.2
Radio	29.0	33.8	23.8	34.6	31.4	10.3
Newspaper	38.2	37.1	39.4	23.4	38.0	12.8
Magazine	30.1	30.4	29.7	22.4	32.3	10.5
Books	33.3	26.8	40.6	28.6	37.5	10.3
Movies	23.9	22.7	25.5	18.6	29.9	3.0
Change in Attitudes						
TV	64.4	57.4	71.9	57.9	26.7	21.6
Radio	38.6	29.9	48.3	30.7	13.1	5.4
Newspaper	46.5	35.3	59.0	41.9	24.0	18.9
Magazine	37.3	26.2	49.2	29.7	15.6	8.1
Books	28.9	26.5	31.7	20.5	12.6	2.7
Movies	35.3	32.8	39.0	28.1	17.6	9.1

[a]The regular students comparison groups includes three psychology courses which contained mostly full-time students.

[b]The extension course comparison group was one social psychology extension course which contained mostly part-time (adult) students.

SECTION II

EVALUATION OF COMMUNICATIONS 100E

ERINDALE COLLEGE

1971-72

by

Donald M. Keller, Ph.D.
Project Officer, Research and Development Branch
The Ontario Educational Communications Authority

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ii

Highlights iii

Introduction 1

Method 5

Results and Discussion 6

- Final Questionnaire 6
- Interviews 18
- Mass Media Survey 22

Conclusions 26

Appendix 27

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The students of Communications 100E, their irstructor Mrs. Sandra Sachs, and Dean Peter Meinke of Erindale College all kindly provided the author with information about Communications 100E. Many of their responses to questions and spontaneous comments have influenced this report. Hopefully, none of their contributions have been overlooked or misinterpreted in the process of writing this evaluation study. The report is mainly factual, rather than interpretative, but the author is solely responsible for whatever judgments have been made.

INTRODUCTION

The course Communications 100E, was offered at Erindale College of the University of Toronto during the 1971/72 academic year. It is based on "Arts 100: Communications--A Course on the New Literacy", a University of Waterloo multimedia course offered at that University in co-operation with The Ontario Educational Communications Authority (OECA). The major component of Arts 100 is 30 weekly half-hour television broadcasts, each of which consists of a lecture by Professor Donald R. Gordon illustrated with numerous and varied visual materials and supplemented by dialogue with a puppet. The other components of Arts 100 are 12 audio-tape cassettes, an assigned text: The New Literacy by Professor Gordon, a reading list, printed notes on the audio and video materials, monthly tutorials held in various locations throughout the area, provision for comments and questions from students via the mail and telephone (the toll-free "hot-line"), an OECA TV production workshop on problems related to production of media material, and seven research assignments to be completed by the students (and on the basis of which they were graded). Arts 100 as taught at Waterloo during 1971/72 did not include regular class meetings at which all students assembled. Arts 100 was designed to accommodate full-time students, part-time students, and non-students working on their own at home (except during the monthly small group tutorials and the single OECA workshop).

In principle, Communications 100E was to be the 'same course' as Arts 100, but certain circumstances led to a number of differences between the two courses. One kind of difference concerned promotion. The decision to offer the course at Erindale was not made until after the formal registration period was over at the College. Thus, students did not know that the course was a possible choice for them until it was about to begin, and by the time it was announced most students were 'settled' in their courses. Furthermore, at least some of the promotional material published to advertise Arts 100 was not available for inspection by prospective students at Erindale. These facts may partially explain the small size of the class and any initial misconceptions the students had about the nature of the course.

A second kind of difference concerned the components of the courses. Arts 100 as taught 'by TV' has been described. Communications 100E differed from it in one very basic way. It was assigned a scheduled meeting time, the first half-hour of which coincided with one of the time slots for the weekly TV programs. Mrs. Sandra Sachs, who had previously taught Arts 100 'live' before the TV lectures were available, was hired by Erindale to meet the class each week at the scheduled time. Thus, Communications 100E met regularly, whereas all the students of Arts 100 never met together. Related to this very basis difference are a number of other differences regarding components: (a) for the first half year the Erindale

students watched the TV programs together in class; (b) Mrs. Sachs provided the students with an extensive reading list which was not the same as the Arts 100 reading list; (c) monthly tutorials were not necessary for the Erindale students since these students met weekly; (d) provision for comments and questions via mail and telephone was likewise unnecessary; (e) Mrs. Sachs chose to evaluate the students on the basis of a major project and an exam, not on the basis of the seven assignments; and (f) the class engaged in various activities which were not equivalent to any of Arts 100's components, including listening to guest speakers, attending a play, visiting a radio studio, and attending a movie. Thus, Communications 100E, although based on Arts 100, was very different from Arts 100.

The purpose of this evaluation is to summarize the opinions of the registered students about Communications 100E. There are no pre-tests or control groups because the decision to undertake the evaluation was not made until after the course was over. Fortunately, an evaluation questionnaire had been filled out at the end of the course. Furthermore, no attempt is made to draw general conclusions. Not only is the number of students small, but there is little justification for trying to say anything about any course except Communications 100E as offered at Erindale during the 1971/72 academic year. Therefore, this evaluation had distinct limitations and should be viewed more as a retrospective case history rather than as either a thorough evaluation of a single course or a collection of data from which broad generalizations can be made.

HIGHLIGHTS

-Most of the students in Communications 100E expected a course on media and media techniques.

-The course fulfilled the expectations of many of the students.

-The overall rating of the course by the students was favourable.

-The best received components of the course were the OECA workshop, the class trips, the class discussions, the guest speakers, and the illustrative materials used in the TV lectures. Also, some of the specific topics, such as hypnotism and advertising were very well received.

-The informality and flexibility with which the course was conducted was greatly appreciated by the students.

-Some components and parts of components of the course were disliked or ignored, including some of the TV programs (those on the brain and senses), some aspects of all the TV programs (the puppet and the technical language), the text, the notes, and the audiotapes.

-The students claimed to have become more critical with respect to the media as sources of information during the period of the course.

METHOD

Twelve Erindale students were registered in the course. Eleven of these completed the Final Questionnaire with attached Mass Media Survey at the end of the academic year. The Questionnaire and Survey were originally designed for students at the University of Waterloo. The Questionnaire consisted of 29 questions, mostly, but not exclusively, of the multiple-choice variety. It was chiefly concerned with opinions regarding the course and its specific components. Five of the original questions were omitted by all students since they did not apply to the course as conducted at Erindale, but five supplemental questions that were pertinent replaced these. A copy of the Questionnaire including the supplemental questions is in the Appendix. The Survey consisted of questions about the student's use of the media and about opinions regarding the media. A copy of the Survey is also in the Appendix.

Seven of the students (all those who could be located at the time) were interviewed over the telephone by the author several weeks after the end of the course. The questions asked concerned how the students had heard about the course, their expectations and the benefits they received, the course components, and how the course should be changed. A list of the questions asked is found in the Appendix.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Final Questionnaire. Table 1 presents the results obtained from the 'objective' items on the Final Questionnaire. In cases where the student expressed his opinion on a five point rating scale (items 1, 3-9, 11, 14-18, 21, 22), numerical scores were assigned to the lettered responses such that the most positive response, a, was assigned a score of five, the second most positive response, b, was assigned a score of four, and so on, so that response e was assigned a score of one. These evaluation scores were averaged for each relevant item and the means, along with the number (N) of students responding to each item are indicated in the column "Results." The items themselves are paraphrased in the column "Item." Thus, for example, the mean of 3.00 for item 9 indicates that, on the average, the students thought the TV lectures were understandable (see alternatives on sample Questionnaire in Appendix).

If we assume that a score of 3.00 (the mid-point of each of the scales) represents a neutral opinion, then the results obtained with the rating scales can be summarized in the following manner: The students were generally positive (favourable) about the course as a whole, as indicated by the fact that the mean evaluation scores on all general items concerning the course (items 1, 3-8, 22) were 3.50 or greater. On the other hand, the students were negative about

TABLE 1

Results obtained from 'objective' questions on the Final Questionnaire

Item[a]		Results
1.	Has course met your personal expectations?	Mean 3.72 N 11
3.	How would you rate Arts 100 overall?	Mean 3.90 N 11
4.	Would you recommend course to a friend?	Mean 4.09 N 11
5.	How interesting was the course?	Mean 4.63 N 11
6.	How would you rate Arts 100 in comparison with other courses?	Mean 3.90 N 11
7.	Was time devoted well spent?	Mean 4.54 N 11
8.	Did it stimulate intellectual curiosity?	Mean 4.36 N 11
9.	How understandable were the lectures?	Mean 3.00 N 11
11.	Worth of textbook.	Mean 2.44 N 9
14.	Worth of TV lectures.	Mean 1.90 N 11
15.	Worth of lecture notes.	Mean 2.44 N 9
16.	Worth of audio tapes.	Mean 2.25 N 4
17.	Worth of OECA workshop.	Mean 3.75 N 4

TABLE 1 - Cont'd

Item[a]		Results	
18. Effects of puppet on TV lectures.	Mean	2.40	
	N	10	
21. Effect of illustrative materials.	Mean	3.90	
	N	10	
22. How format compares with "standard".	Mean	3.50	
	N	10	
10. Amount of material covered in lectures.	Too much	4	(36.3%)
	About right	5	(45.4%)
	Too little	2	(18.1%)
19. Use of "academic" language.	Too much	4	(50.0%)
	About right	4	(50.0%)
	Too little	0	(00.0%)
20. Time prof. was on camera.	Too much	4	(40.0%)
	About right	6	(60.0%)
	Too little	0	(00.0%)
25. Any effect in what you do, think, feel, etc.?	Yes	9	(81.8%)
	No	2	(18.2%)
26. (A) Average time spent on course?	Mean	212.4	Minutes
	N	7	
(B) In comparison with other courses?	More	1	(16.7%)
	Same	1	(16.7%)
	Less	4	(66.7%)
S1. Should course be taught again at Erindale?	Yes	10	(100.0%)
	No	0	(00.0%)
S2. Should TV format be taught?	Yes[b]	3	(30.0%)
	No	7	(70.0%)
S3. Same format, but without TV?	Yes[b]	9	(90.0%)
	No	1	(10.0%)

[a] Items are abbreviated and slightly rearranged for better tabular presentation.

[b] Two of those responding "yes" proposed extensive modifications.

most of the components of the course they were asked about, as indicated by the fact that the mean scores for the worth of the textbook, TV lectures, lecture notes, audio tapes, and puppet (a part of the TV programs) were all 2.44 or less. Finally, two components do 'buck the trend'. The worth of the OECA workshop was given a mean score of 3.75 and the effectiveness of the illustrative materials used in the TV lectures was rated at 3.90.

There appears to be a contradiction in the data. Communications 100E was very favourably received, and yet most of its components were not favourably received! It seems unreasonable to believe that the course as a whole could be so well liked when the only worthwhile components were the OECA workshop that was attended by only four of the eleven students (presumably, since N=4 for that item) and the illustrative materials of the TV programs. This contradiction can be explained, however, by the presence of course components that were not asked about in the Final Questionnaire. As indicated in the Introduction, Communications 100E included components other than those asked about on the Questionnaire. The popularity of these was great and probably accounts for the generally favourable reception of the course. Which of the course's components were favourably received will become clear when the results of the open-ended questions and of the interviews are

considered.

The remaining results listed in Table 1 (items 10, 19, 20, 25, 26) require little explanation since in all but one case (item 26A) the actual response alternatives and frequencies with which each was chosen are indicated. Thus, it can be noted that the amount of material covered in the lectures, the use (amount) of "academic" language, and the time the professor was on camera tended to be perceived as too much rather than too little, although in all three cases many students replied about right. These results support the conclusion that something was less than ideal about the TV lectures in the opinion of many students and suggest that the lectures were 'too much' with respect to both amount of material and its technical nature.

The responses to item 26A indicate that the mean time spent by students on the course was about 3.5 hours. (The median time, however, was less than three hours.) This was felt to be less than the time spent on other courses. Since there was a two hour class meeting scheduled during most weeks, the mean number of non-class hours is presumably about 1.5.

The final three items of Table 1 are the three yes-no supplemental questions (S1, S2, S3). The responses to these questions indicate that most students feel Communications 100E should be taught again at Erindale, but that the "television format" should not be employed. Once again, the results point

to the students' antipathy towards the TV component.

The verbatim responses to the open-ended questions (items 25, 27-29, S4, S5) are presented in Table 2. (In this table the several reactions of a single student to a particular item are grouped together on successive lines, while reactions from different students are separated by several lines.) Table 1 indicated that nine of the eleven students felt the course had affected them (item 25). The elaborations listed in Table 2 indicate that the perceived effects include increased exposure to ideas, critical ability, facts, insight, understanding, and communication ability. These and the other effects listed suggest that different students have different ideas about how the course affected them.

Items 27-29, S4, and S5 all deal, in one way or another, with what is right and/or wrong about Communications 100E. In general, the students liked or wanted more of the following: trips, guest lecturers, discussions, informality, freedom, reading lists, workshop, some specific topics, some specific TV programs, class projects, and practical technical experience. The students did not like or wanted less or the following: the TV programs (especially the puppet and the material on the senses), the "handbook" (program notes?), and the relative lack of structure.

It is very clear on the basis of the Final Questionnaire

TABLE 2

Verbatim responses to open ended questions
on Final Questionnaire

---

25. Beyond providing course content, has Arts 100 had any effect on what you do, think, believe, etc.? Please elaborate.

-More exposed to different facets of communication - to new ideas.

-Made me more critical of the various media.

-I could explore topics I wanted to and hence learned about advertising, Canadian Content Regulation, Radio Broadcasting, & Camera work better.

-Gain insight, new perspective
-Better understanding of oneself
-Enabled me to communicate more effectively

-I have learned to communicate yet cannot really express myself properly, at the moment.

-It made me realize that the media exist.

-Profound effect, it allowed me to take "part" in a course.

-Educated me regarding the ad industry.

TABLE 2 - Cont'd

27. The most valuable aspects of the course were...

-Trips, guest lecturers & discussions with them after class.

-Some of the TV programs; discussions.

-The informality
-The closeness of the prof.
-The diversity of all of our interests blended
-We were free to delve into topics of our own choice at anytime right down to the final exam

-Guest speakers
-Flexibility of course content in tutorial period
-Tutorial leader was understanding
-Was interested in exploring our areas of interest
-Gave us opportunity to choose topics for discussion

-Reading lists and references

-The most valuable aspects of the course were the program workshop and guest speakers. The course was extremely informational in respect to current problems in the media (effects of advertising, CATC disputes, how the media are manipulated - both good & bad.)

-The programs on hypnosis and what is good and bad about the media.

-Advertising studies
-Guest speakers
-Cultural aspects

-Sparked interest in new topics - subliminal, communication, brainwashing etc.

TABLE 2 - Cont'd

28. The least valuable aspects of the course were...

-Video Tapes

-Puppet

-More organization in the seminars
-We should have been able to prepare more for many of the seminars (by knowing the topic to be discussed).

-TV format was unappealing to me

-The handbook for the course

-The TV programs. Somehow TV programs are intimidating. There is no give & take - just take. Some areas covered in the program, specifically the program on the senses were interesting biologically but we were concerned with communication - not that it was completely irrelevant but just overdone.

-The first 5 programs were of little use.

-TV lectures

-Technical TV programs on mechanics of seeing, hearing etc.

TABLE 2 - Cont'd

29. How would you like to see the course changed?

-More emphasis on actual techniques of film, VTR
-How to assemble a film to get the effect you want
-How do film-makers communicate - what difference does the editing, of the sound background make to the meaning of the film

-Take out the puppet, treat university students like university students perhaps more research work

-More handling of cameras etc.

-I would like to see the TV programs eliminated and more time spent on things like workshops such as the one at Scarborough College

-Drop the TV
-More class projects eg. get advertising men & men in all other areas of communication to talk

-A more free format, minus TV lectures

TABLE 2 - Cont'd

S4. What other recommendations would you have for next year?

-More practical knowledge, plus more knowledge of the phil. of communications - a closer look at techniques.

-Less difficult assignments on TV; more research.

-None
-Keep it as informal as it was this year with the emphasis on individual incentive.

-More technical work - eg. workshops
-exposure to radio & films a bit more
-More field trips - to radio stations, CBC, newspapers

-I recommend a complete revamping of the course. It should include a variety of topics such as - Mass Media (theoretical study), Audio-Visual Techniques (practical study), Advertising practical), & my most enjoyable part of the year, Marketing & Photo Journalism.

-A more free format giving professor more choice of material to be covered.

-More funds
-Seminars
-Same small classes

-Would recommend more practical experience in use of audio-visual equipment
-More fieldtrips

TABLE 2 - Cont'd

S5. What other comments do you have regarding Communications 100E this year?

-Could have wished for a bit more practical knowledge, but in general very interesting. Exposure to many facets - advertising, hypnotism, theatre, movies, video as movies etc.

-Worthwhile but perhaps needs more structure

-Workshop at Scarborough College - extremely interesting lectures - were informative & interesting
-Informal atmosphere was very nice to work in
-TV programs - some were interesting but obviously one-sided mechanical type of situation
-I enjoyed the course

-Good
-Stimulating lectures
-Interesting guests
-High level of sophistication
-Perhaps students should be a little more sure what was expected of them

-Interesting
-Liked open discussions
-There seemed to be a lack of funds for anything we wanted to do.

-Could be more structural

-The variety of guest speakers was excellent
-Enabled us to examine many aspects of the communications media
-Well chosen & informative speakers
-choice of topics covered was flexible - this was appropriate because students had the opportunity to explore their interests & yet learn new aspects of communication.

-As an idea - it was great. I thoroughly enjoyed attending your classes and hope that you will go into the teaching field. It was so refreshing to see someone who doesn't use regimentation in lectures. I enjoyed your guest speakers and particularly the advertising man. The outings to the theatre were well studied and of great importance to cultural formation. The TV lectures were - plain & simple. I feel that video-tape lectures are too inanimate which results in the student's disinterest in them. You can't ask a taped professor a question.

that most of the components of Arts 100 were not regarded as worthwhile. They certainly did not contribute greatly to the positive reception of the course as a whole. Of the regular (Arts 100) course components, only the workshop and some of the TV programs were well liked. Some of the TV programs and techniques were disliked enough for the students to suggest major changes in them. Presumably, the other components that were used were not disliked, although they were not considered to be valuable. The non-Arts 100 components of Communications 100E that were liked include trips, guests, discussions, technical experience, projects, and some specific topics. The favourable reception of these components explains the discrepancy between the overall positive reaction to Communications 100E and the negative reactions to so many of the Arts 100 components.

Interviews. The answers to the interview questions as recorded by the author are found in Table 3. It is important to remember that only seven of the students were interviewed, and therefore the results may be based on an unrepresentative sample. Each line beginning with a hyphen (-) indicates the answer of a different student. Item 1 requires little comment except to remind the reader that the information available to the prospective student may have been limited. The initial expectations as listed in item 2 tend to revolve around two major themes: media and experience with equipment. 'Officially', media was only part of the subject matter of

the course; also, equipment experience was a very small part of the course. Thus, the initial expectations were discrepant with respect to the course as originally conceived to the extent that the course was to contain many topics and experiences that the students were not expecting (or, rather, which they did not recall expecting when questioned in May). The replies to item 3 indicate that in spite of whatever discrepancies may have existed between initial expectations and reality, a good number of the students (about half of those interviewed) felt that their expectations had been fulfilled.

When asked about what they got out of the course the students mentioned a variety of skills and topics which practically defy generalization. They ranged from philosophy of communication to technical information to experience (item 4). When asked about what the course consisted of, however, there was relatively great agreement as might be expected given a factual question (item 5). It consisted of TV, trips (including trips to see plays and movies), speakers, discussion, projects (all of which were mentioned by a number of students), and a few other components such as an exam, program notes, equipment, labs, and reading list (each of which was mentioned by only one of the seven students interviewed). It is interesting to note that certain components of the course were not mentioned at all (e.g., the text) although other evidence (the Final Questionnaire) indicates they were known to at least some of the students. In a few

TABLE 3

Verbatim responses to interview questions

---

1. How did you hear about Arts 100?

-was going to take Communications 220 and Communications 100 was recommended
-bulletin board
-registrar (wanted another communications)
-a friend; bulletin board
-poster
-friend; notices
-bulletin board; people who liked it

2. What did you initially expect to get from the course?

-media, influences, equipment, hands on experience
-technically, TV, equipment
-other course was ½ course
-something different; cameras
-study of media & its effects on people
-communications - media, technique, effects, a little philosophy
-broader view of communication topics, advertising, McLuhan, practical

3. Were these initial expectations fulfilled?

-yes, workshop at Scarborough
-no
-?
-yes, but senses screwed it up
-yes, own work
-nil for Arts 100? (not in depth)
-yes

4. What did you get out of the course?

-experience, useful information about commercials, CRTC etc.
-plays, cable TV, basic introduction
-technical information, subliminal media, McLuhan, broad range
-different media, movies plays etc., workshop, advertising, bad TV
-just talking, visitors
-broader view of philosophy of communication, where

TABLE 3 - Cont'd

---

to go for information about communication
-practical stuff (advertising, marketing), speakers

5. What, actually, did the course consist of?

-TV, guests, trips, discussion
-TV, speakers, plays, movies
-TV, speakers, exam, projects
-projects, equipment
-TV, discussion, visitors, movies
-seminar, labs, program notes, list of tapes, class discussion, TV, speakers, trips, project, reading list
-TV, speakers, plays

6. (I know this has been asked before, but...)
How would you change the course?

-No TV
-No TV, too much like Sesame Street, too slow (boring)
-TV worst, couldn't hold attention, too many technical terms, better when course wasn't on TV
-No TV & discussion of TV, do your own thing
-Wouldn't, but more selective on TV side
-TV: More clear cut, no crammed information, no frog, better organization, slow down the superfluous, too simple, distracting but interesting, more information less image
-No TV: too intangible, more personal contact, no senses, no frog, you can't ask a TV a question

cases, the author pursued the matter by specifically asking about the audio tapes. In these cases, the students usually added that they had not used them. Again the data led to the conclusion that a number of the course components (audio tapes, books, and notes) were not of value to many of the students; these components were simply ignored by most students when the composition of the course was asked about.

The responses to item 6, about changes, tended to stress, even more than did the similar items on the Questionnaire (items 29 and S4), that the TV component should be improved or eliminated. There was considerable variety in the specifics, and in some cases there were contradictions--one student would like the TV programs slowed down, while another thought they were too slow. But the students interviewed are unanimous in feeling that the TV programs should be changed in some way. The students do not ignore the TV component; they advocate specific changes in it.

Mass Media Survey. Table 4 gives the results of the Mass Media Survey. The responses to item 1 indicate that in terms of time spent with the media as sources of information, the students averaged 7.05 hours with television, 11.83 hours with radio, 3.45 hours with newspapers, and so on. The ordering of the media in these terms, in descending order, was radio, television, books, newspapers, magazines, and movies.

The responses to item 2 indicate that the students tend to perceive radio and books as the most accurate sources of

information, to perceive movies as the most biased, and to believe that the specific material they watch, listen to, or read is somewhat more accurate than media supplied information in general, with the greatest discrepancy being between the television they watch and television in general.

The responses to items 3 and 4 are hard to interpret without considering the students' elaborations, except perhaps by noting that the students' use and opinions of television and newspapers have changed more (in their judgment) than have their use and opinions of the other media. Unfortunately, the recorded elaborations (which are not presented) are sparse and not always relevant, but if trends can be based on two or three comments per medium then a few can be discerned. One is that overall there seems to be more mention of increase in media use than decrease. However, among the most 'active' media television decreases in use, while newspapers increase. Some of the increases are due to the students' having more time to read "now that school is over." A second trend, probably the most important regarding the course and the media, concerns the responses to item 4. Most of the elaborations for all the media suggest an increase in caution towards the medium in question as a source of information.

TABLE 4

Results of the Mass Media Survey

Question			Results	
1.	On the average how many hours a week do you spend on each of the following media as a source of information? Please elaborate.			
	(a) TV		Mean N	7.05 10
	(b) Radio		Mean N	11.83 9
	(c) Newspapers		Mean N	3.45 10
	(d) Magazines		Mean N	2.43 8
	(e) Books		Mean N	7.78 7
	(f) Movies (not on TV)		Mean N	2.08 6
2.	Below please indicate your opinion regarding how accurate as sources of information the various media are. Do this separately for: (1) the media in general, and (2) your choice from each of them.			
	(a) TV:	In general	Mean 2.27 N 11	What I watch Mean 2.66 N 9
	(b) Radio:	In general	Mean 2.70 N 10	What I listen to Mean 3.00 N 9
	(c) Newspapers:	In general	Mean 2.09 N 11	What I read Mean 2.22 N 9
	(d) Magazines:	In general	Mean 2.60 N 10	What I read Mean 2.66 N 9
	(e) Books:	In general	Mean 2.72 N 10	What I read Mean 2.80 N 9
	(f) Movies (not on TV):	In general	Mean 1.50 N 8	What I watch Mean 1.57 N 7

TABLE 4 - Cont'd

Question		Results		
3.	Has there been any change in your use of these media in recent months? Please elaborate.			
	(a) TV	Yes	5	(45.4%)
		No	6	(54.5%)
	(b) Radio	Yes	2	(20.0%)
		No	8	(80.0%)
	(c) Newspapers	Yes	5	(50.0%)
		No	5	(50.0%)
	(d) Magazines	Yes	2	(18.1%)
		No	9	(81.8%)
	(e) Books	Yes	4	(36.3%)
		No	7	(63.6%)
	(f) Movies (not on TV)	Yes	2	(20.0%)
		No	8	(80.0%)
4.	Has there been any change in your opinions of or attitudes toward these media in recent months?			
	(a) TV	Yes	8	(72.7%)
		No	3	(27.2%)
	(b) Radio	Yes	4	(36.3%)
		No	7	(63.6%)
	(c) Newspapers	Yes	6	(54.5%)
		No	5	(45.4%)
	(d) Magazines	Yes	3	(27.2%)
		No	8	(72.7%)
	(e) Books	Yes	1	(09.0%)
		No	10	(90.9%)
	(f) Movies (not on TV)	Yes	1	(09.0%)
		No	10	(90.9%)

CONCLUSIONS

Trends can be discerned in the data leading to the following conclusions: Most of the students expected a course on media and media techniques. Furthermore, most of those interviewed had their expectations fulfilled.

The overall rating of the course was favourable, but most of the components of the course that led to this favour were components that were not part of Arts 100. These well-received non-Arts 100 components include class trips, guest speakers, and class discussions. Certain other aspects of the course were also well-liked, such as the informality with which it was conducted, and some of the specific topics.

Many of the Arts 100 components were not considered valuable by the Erindale students. These included the text the audio tapes, and the lecture notes. The TV programs in general and certain specific aspects of them (the puppet, the lectures themselves, some specific topics, the technical language) evoked many recommendations for change. One aspect of the TV programs, the illustrative material, was considered to be valuable. Also, one Arts 100 component was given a clearly positive rating--the OECA workshop.

A final relevant trend that can be detected is that towards more caution with respect to the media. That is, the students who claim their opinions of or attitudes toward the media have changed in recent months usually claim that this change is in the direction of greater caution.

APPENDIX

1. Final Questionnaire
2. Mass Media Survey
3. Interview Questions

Project Code Number: _____

ARTS 100 EVALUATION PROJECT
Final Questionnaire

Student status: _____ full-time
_____ part-time degree
_____ non-degree part-time

Did you apply to the University primarily to take Arts 100? _____ yes
_____ no

Were you admitted as a "mature" student (did not meet the University's regular grade 13 admission requirements)? _____ yes; _____ no

Please answer questions 1-22 by circling the letter of the alternative that best answers each question. Place any comments about your answers in the spaces to the right of the alternatives. If an item asks you to evaluate part of the course which you haven't done (e.g., the OECA workshop) or materials you haven't used (e.g., the audio tapes), ignore that item.

1. To what extent has Arts 100 met your personal expectations?

(a) almost completely | Comments ...
(b) to a considerable extent
(c) somewhat
(d) a little
(e) not at all

2. To what extent has Arts 100 met the objectives stated in its brochure?

OMIT THIS QUESTION

(a) almost completely | Comments ...
(b) to a considerable extent
(c) somewhat
(d) a little
(e) not at all

3. How would you rate Arts 100 overall?

(a) excellent | Comments ...
(b) very good
(c) good
(d) fair
(e) poor

4. Would you recommend to a friend that he or she take Arts 100?

(a) yes, recommend it highly | Comments ...
(b) yes
(c) don't know
(d) no
(e) definitely not

5. How interesting did you find the course?

(a) extremely interesting	Comments ...
(b) quite interesting	
(c) interesting	
(d) not very interesting	
(e) boring	

6. How would you rate Arts 100 in comparison with other university courses?

(a) one of the best	Comments ...
(b) better than most	
(c) about average	
(d) not as good as most	
(e) one of the poorest	

7. Do you feel that the time devoted to Arts 100 was well spent?

(a) always	Comments ...
(b) usually	
(c) sometimes	
(d) seldom	
(e) never	

8. How intellectually stimulating did you find the course?

(a) highly	Comments ...
(b) quite	
(c) somewhat	
(d) slightly	
(e) not at all	

9. How understandable did you find the TV lectures?

(a) extremely understandable	Comments ...
(b) quite understandable	
(c) understandable	
(d) not very understandable	
(e) not at all understandable	

10. How do you feel about the amount of material covered in the lectures?

(a) too much	Comments ...
(b) just about right	
(c) too little	

11. How worthwhile did you find the book "The New Literacy"?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

12. How worthwhile did you find the monthly seminars?

OMIT THIS QUESTION

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

13. How worthwhile did you find the assignments?

OMIT THIS QUESTION

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

14. How worthwhile did you find the T.V. lectures?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

15. How worthwhile did you find the notes on the lectures?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

16. How worthwhile did you find the audio tapes?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

17. How worthwhile did you find the OECA TV workshop?

(a) extremely worthwhile	Comments ...
(b) quite worthwhile	
(c) worthwhile	
(d) of little worth	
(e) a waste of time	

18. What effect do you think the use of the puppet had on the TV lectures?

(a) considerably aided	Comments ...
(b) somewhat aided	
(c) neither aided nor detracted	
(d) somewhat detracted	
(e) considerably detracted	

19. How do you feel about Professor Gordon's use of "academic" or technical language?

(a) too much of it
(b) just about right
(c) too little of it

Comments ...

20. How do you feel about the amount of time Prof. Gordon was on camera?

(a) too much
(b) just about right
(c) too little

Comments ...

21. How effective did you find the illustrative materials used in the TV lectures?

(a) considerably aided
(b) somewhat aided
(c) neither aided nor detracted
(d) somewhat detracted
(e) considerably detracted

Comments ...

22. How do you feel the format of Arts 100 compares with "standard" university course formats?

(a) much better
(b) better
(c) about as good
(d) not as good
(e) much worse

Comments ...

23 a). Did the "hot line" satisfactorily meet your needs?

OMIT THIS QUESTION

_____ yes
_____ no
_____ didn't use

If you checked "no" or "didn't use", please indicate why.

_____

_____

(b). What other arrangements would you like to see for receiving your comments, providing you with help or feedback, etc.?

_____

_____

24. Did you find that secondary reading materials were accessible enough for your needs? _____ yes; _____ no

OMIT THIS QUESTION

Please elaborate. _____

_____

25. Beyond providing course content, has Arts 100 had any effect on what you do, think, believe, etc.? _____ yes; _____ no

Please elaborate. _____

_____

_____

26. Roughly how much time per week did you spend on Arts 100 (including TV viewing, reading, preparing assignments, etc.)?

Average time spent per week = _____ hours.

In comparison with other courses Arts 100 took:

_____ more time
_____ about the same amount of time
_____ less time

27. The most valuable aspects of the course were ...

28. The least valuable aspects of the course were ...

29. How would you like to see the course changed?

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS FROM THE FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

S1. Would you recommend that Communications 100E be taught at Erindale next year?

S2. Should the TV format be taught?

S3. Should a course of the same format, but not using the Arts 100 Waterloo TV format be used?

S4. What other recommendations would you have for next year?

S5. What other comments do you have regarding Communications 100E this year?

MASS MEDIA SURVEY

1. On the average how many hours a week do you spend on each of the following media as a source of information?

(a) TV	_____	Please elaborate ...
(b) Radio	_____	
(c) Newspapers	_____	
(d) Magazines	_____	
(e) Books	_____	
(f) Movies (not on TV)	_____	
Other: _____	_____	
_____	_____	

2. Below please indicate your opinions regarding how accurate as sources of information the various media are. Do this separately for: (1) the media in general, and (2) your choice from each of them.

		Quite Accurate	Reasonably Accurate	Somewhat Biased	Quite Biased
TV:	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I watch	_____	_____	_____	_____
Radio:	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I listen to	_____	_____	_____	_____
Newspapers:	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I read	_____	_____	_____	_____
Magazines:	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I read	_____	_____	_____	_____
Books:	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I read	_____	_____	_____	_____
Movies (not on TV):	In general	_____	_____	_____	_____
	What I watch	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other: _____		_____	_____	_____	_____
_____		_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

3. Has there been any change in your use of these media in recent months?

	Yes	No	Please elaborate:
(a) TV	___	___	_____
(b) Radio	___	___	_____
(c) Newspapers	___	___	_____
(d) Magazines	___	___	_____
(e) Books	___	___	_____
(f) Movies (not on TV)	___	___	_____
Other: _____	___	___	_____
_____	___	___	_____

4. Has there been any change in your opinions of or attitudes toward these media in recent months?

	Yes	No	Please elaborate:
(a) TV	___	___	_____
(b) Radio	___	___	_____
(c) Newspapers	___	___	_____
(d) Magazines	___	___	_____
(e) Books	___	___	_____
(f) Movies (not on TV)	___	___	_____
Other: _____	___	___	_____
_____	___	___	_____

Please write any comments about this questionnaire below. Additional comments about the questionnaire or Arts 100 can be written on the back of this page.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How did you hear about Arts 100?

2. What did you initially expect to get from the course?

3. Were these initial expectations fulfilled?

4. What did you get out of the course?

5. What, actually, did the course consist of?

6. (I know this has been asked before, but...) How would you change the course?